

Cal Poly Apparel Manufacturing Demonstration - Year 4 and 5 Final Technical Report

Performance Period: 12/01/98 - 11/30/00

(Proprietary version for DLA-PM)

Date: May 21, 2001

**Apparel Technology and Research Center
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona**

Prepared by ATRC Staff

20010716 121

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGEForm Approved
OMB No. 074-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE May 21, 2001	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Final Technical Report 12/01/98 – 11/30/00	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Cal Poly Apparel Manufacturing Demonstration Year 4/5 Final Technical Report			5. FUNDING NUMBERS SPO100-95-D1012	
6. AUTHOR(S) Apparel Technology & Research Center Staff				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Apparel Technology & Research Center Cal Poly Pomona 3801 W. Temple Ave., #45 Pomona, CA 91768			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT		DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A Approved for Public Release Distribution Unlimited		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 Words) <p>The Cal Poly Demo (Demo) was established to be a research and demonstration manufacturing activity to support the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) and the Defense Supply Center, Philadelphia (DSCP). The DLA's Apparel Research Network (ARN) focus for the Demo included several areas of activity. The Demo was directed to study the costs and problems associated with the manufacturing of military apparel items. The Demo factory activity was required to produce commercial as well as military products to meet the DLA objective of shared production. Since the Southern California apparel industry is primarily small businesses producing low volume fashion products, the Cal Poly Demo factory needed to reflect the size and capability of its customer audience to be a credible demonstration to industry. In addition, the DSCP was having difficulty placing certain low volume products on contract with commercial producers. Thus, the Cal Poly Demo factory chose to specialize in producing and studying relatively low volume products such as the Marine men's short sleeve dress shirt, Marine maternity dress uniform and maternity Battle Dress Uniform. Other areas of work included military contractor recruitment, interaction with industry (Coalition, education and assistance) and Virtual Prime Vendor.</p>				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Year 4/5 Final Technical Report			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 154	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	

Cal Poly Apparel Manufacturing Demonstration - Year 4 and 5 Final Technical Report

Performance Period: 12/01/98 - 11/30/00

(Proprietary version for DLA-PM)

Date: May 21, 2001

**Apparel Technology and Research Center
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona**

Prepared by ATRC Staff

Foreword

The Cal Poly (CP) Apparel Technology and Research Center (ATRC) was funded by the Defense Logistics Agency's (DLA) Apparel Research Network (ARN) to establish a research and demonstration manufacturing activity (Demo). The work of the CP ATRC Demo as part of the ARN program, was in support of the DLA and the Defense Supply Center, Philadelphia (DSCP) by:

1. Conducting studies on costs and problems associated with the manufacturing of military garments;
2. Manufacturing military garments the DSCP had difficulty placing with commercial businesses;
3. Recruiting new businesses to become military contractors through an incubator production program; and
4. Transferring the lessons learned in the demonstration factory to industry through an industry advisory committee, a newsletter, a web site and other events and activities.

Results of the Year 4 and 5 activities follow in this report.

In addition, as part of Year 4 work individual reports have been completed on the following military items:

- a. Marine men's short sleeve shirt
- b. Marine maternity dress uniform - tunic, skirt, slack
- c. All service maternity Battle Dress Uniform (BDU) - coat and slack

Reports identified above are posted on the Apparel Research Network (ARN) website at <http://arn.iitri.org> and are titled:

Marine Maternity Dress Uniform Tunic, Skirt and Slack Final Report

All Service Maternity Battle Dress Uniform Final Report

Marine Short Sleeve Shirt Final Report

Indirect Labor Activity Cost Study for a Sample Military Apparel Contract

The Cal Poly Demonstration also participated in the DLA Virtual Prime Vendor (VPV) initiative. This activity was dedicated to making improvements in the DLA Clothing and Textile supply chain. Reports concerning this activity are also posted on the ARN website.

Lastly, at the end of this report there appears a summary of lessons learned in operating an activity of this size and type over the two-year option contract period.

Executive Summary

Year 4 and 5 Demo Activities

As stated in the Foreword, the Cal Poly Demo was established to be a research and demonstration manufacturing activity to support the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) and the Defense Supply Center, Philadelphia (DSCP). The DLA's Apparel Research Network (ARN) focus for the Demo included several areas of activity.

The Demo was directed to study the costs and problems associated with the manufacturing of military apparel items. The Demo factory activity was required to produce commercial as well as military products to meet the DLA objective of shared production. Since the Southern California apparel industry is primarily small businesses producing low volume fashion products, the Cal Poly Demo factory needed to reflect the size and capability of its customer audience to be a credible demonstration to industry. In addition, the DSCP was having difficulty placing certain low volume products on contract with commercial producers. Thus, the Cal Poly Demo factory chose to specialize in producing and studying relatively low volume products.

Specific issues affecting the military garments of the Marine men's short sleeve dress shirt, the Marine maternity dress uniform (tunic, slack and skirt) and the maternity Battle Dress Uniform are documented in separate reports. These reports are posted on the Apparel Research Network (ARN) web site at <http://arn.iitri.org>. This report includes additional issues on these items that occurred during Years 4 and 5.

Some specific challenges and general issues in Years 4 and 5 concerning the manufacturing activity included:

- 1) additional manufacturing issues related to military items,
- 2) lessons learned regarding quality problems in two Coast Guard shirts,
- 3) common problems in manufacturing military items,
- 4) implementation of a new quality system,
- 5) success as a credible demonstration,
- 6) improvement of the manufacturing infrastructure, and
- 7) meeting cash match requirements while achieving a break even financial status.

Major issues related to manufacturing the Marine men's short sleeve shirt, the Marine maternity dress uniform, and the maternity Battle Dress Uniform included pattern problems, defective government furnished material problems and sourcing problems.

During Year 5 the Demo evaluated the patterns and specifications for two Coast Guard shirts that the DSCP was having quality problems with. The Demo determined changes that needed to be made to both to produce a quality garment.

Manufacturing of all military items had the same common problems of:

- a) timely receipt of promised delivery orders,
- b) timely receipt of promised contract modifications,
- c) timely response to contract questions,
- d) problems with government paperwork, and
- e) shortages on gfm shipments.

The Demo implemented the Military Standard 105E quality system during Year 5 to meet both commercial retail and government quality requirements.

The Demo was set up as a modular manufacturing plant to show industry there was a better way to manufacture lower volume products. The Demo was disappointed more companies did not move forward with adoption of this system but was very pleased with the continuing requests from industry for technical information.

The Demo continued its efforts to improve its own internal operations as a small manufacturer.

The DLA Demo activity had a cash match requirement in an effort to develop a self-supporting capability for the activity. With a decrease in DLA funding during Years 4 and 5, the requirement to operate on a break even basis became a very difficult challenge for the Demo. The ATRC produced a variety of products to meet the cash match requirement. A list of 33 commercial customers and their products produced during Years 4 and 5 can be found in Appendix B.

The Demo factory continued to assist the DSCP with production of hard to procure items. The DSCP was unable to place two sets of items at a commercial producer because of the low volume nature of the work. The items included the maternity Battle Dress Uniform coat and slack and the Marine maternity dress uniform tunic, slack, skirt and two shirts. The maternity BDU contract was the one project that had an additional element beyond the production need. The BDU items were used as part of an incubator project to develop a local producer capable of manufacturing the items directly for the DSCP. A Demo Coalition (industry advisory committee) member who had a long-term interest in doing military contract work was the company chosen to be the incubator participant. Results at the end of Year 5 were positive. The Coalition company benefited from the production of an item that stayed the

same for an extended period of time. The incubator arrangement allowed the company during Year 4 to develop the pre-production and sourcing capability requirements of military contract work. The incubator company submitted a proposal to the DSCP for the solicitation that was released in the Fall of 1999 for these two items. As of this writing the DSCP had recently called the ATRC for a reference check on the incubator company.

At the time the Demo activity started in 1995 the DSCP had very few West Coast companies amongst their vendors. The Demo worked very actively during Year 3 to recruit apparel businesses on the West Coast to become military contractors for the DSCP. In the spring of 1999, DLA program management agreed the effort had been successful and the decision to cease with the activity was made.

The Demo continued in Years 4 and 5 with transferring information about the Demo activity to industry. The DLA was interested in communicating the lessons learned at the Demo that benefited both military and commercial production in the Demo factory as well as industry at large. Working with an industry advisory committee (Coalition) was key to transferring information as well as developing support from industry for the Demo activity. The Coalition had 57 members and three working groups with active projects of benefit to industry. In addition, the Demo published a newsletter, maintained a website, distributed information packets/ brochures/ flyers, attended trade shows/industry events/meetings, hosted tours of the Demo factory, hosted industry/vendor/customer events, and developed relationships with industry and support organizations.

The Demo continued its involvement in the DLA/DSCP initiative of Virtual Prime Vendor. This project area was dedicated to making improvements in the government Clothing and Textile supply chain through total asset visibility, changes in the ordering and manufacturing activities to a "balanced flow" operational scenario, and significant inventory reduction. The first step in the process was to make improvements at the retail customer. The Marine Corp Recruit Depot - San Diego (MCRD-SD) was selected for the initial work at retail. Complete documentation of the MCRD- SD and Ft. Leonard Wood activity from March 1997 to the Fall of 1999 are documented in the ARN research report of VPV T1P1 that can be found on the ARN web site at <http://arn.iitri.org>. Overall, the project realized the desired results for both San Diego and the Virtual Prime Vendor initiative. Other areas of activity included work at the wholesale level and the Defense Apparel Manufacturers (DAMs) level. During Years 4 and 5 the Cal Poly Demo worked mostly in the testing and implementation of new software to be used by the DAMs.

Lastly, at the end of this report appears a summary of the "lessons learned" in operating an activity of this size and type over the two-year option contract period. This section documents areas other than specific programmatic

activities such as budget/cash match requirements, business plan requirements, overall administration, reporting, and staffing issues related to budgetary/programmatic changes.

Table of Contents

Foreword	2
Executive Summary	3
1.0 Introduction	10
1.1 Background and Objectives	10
1.2 Scope and Methodology	11
2.0 Manufacturing Activity	12
2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 Additional Manufacturing Issues Related to Military Items	13
2.2.1 Marine Men's Short Sleeve Dress Shirt	13
2.2.2 Maternity Battle Dress Uniform (BDU)	13
2.2.3 Marine Maternity Dress Uniform	14
2.3 Lessons Learned Regarding Quality Problems in Two Coast Guard Shirts	14
2.4 Common Problems in Manufacturing Military Items.	15
2.5 Implementation of a New Quality System	16
2.6 Success as a Credible Demonstration	16
2.7 Improvement of the Manufacturing Infrastructure	16
2.8 Meeting Cash Match Requirements While Achieving a Break Even Financial Status	17
3.0 Hard to Procure Products	19
3.1 Introduction	19
3.2 Hard to Procure Items Produced by the Demo Factory	19
3.3 Maternity BDU Contract – Incubator Project	19
3.4 Summary	20
4.0 Military Contractor Recruitment	21
4.1 Introduction	21
4.2 Results	21
5.0 Information Dissemination to and Interaction with Industry	22
5.1 Introduction	22
5.2 Information Provided to Industry	22
5.2.1 Newsletter	22
5.2.2 Web Site	23

5.2.3	Information Packets/Brochures/Flyers	23
5.2.4	Publications and Presentations	24
5.2.5	Wall Visuals	24
5.2.6	Tours/Contacts with Industry	24
5.2.7	Education Activities	25
5.2.8	Training	26
5.2.9	"The Source"	27
5.3	Interaction with Industry	27
5.3.1	Coalition	27
5.3.1.1	Restructure	28
5.3.1.2	Identify and Perform Services Industry Needs	28
5.3.2	Increase Vendor/Customer/Donor Relationships	29
5.3.3	Develop Relationships with Industry and Support Organizations	29
5.3.3.1	Industry Organizations	29
5.3.3.2	Support Organizations	29
5.3.4	Service and Assistance to the Apparel Industry	30
5.3.5	Service to the Apparel Merchandising & Management Degree Program and the University	30
5.4	Develop Goldmine Database and Document Interaction	31
6.0	Virtual Prime Vendor	32
6.1	Introduction	32
6.2	ASAPWeb Tool Development	33
6.3	ASAPWeb Implementation at the DAMs	34
6.4	AAVS DataMart	36
6.5	VIM Site	37
6.6	Other Software Applications	37
6.7	Miscellaneous VPV Tasks	37
7.0	Establishment of a Demonstration Project – Lessons Learned	38
7.1	Introduction	38
7.2	Staffing	38
7.3	Business Plan	39
7.4	Budget Balancing Issues/Cash Match Requirement	39
7.5	Institutional Infrastructure Support	41
7.6	Support from the Technology Vendors	42
7.7	Response from Industry	42
7.8	Reporting Requirements	42
7.9	Overall Management Issues	43
8.0	Summary and Future Plans	44

Appendices	45
A. Glossary	46
B. List of Products Made at ATRC Demo	48
C. Equipment List	51
D. Manufacturing Activity Logs	54
E. List of Published Articles about the ATRC	91
F. List of Presentations	93
G. Coalition Members	95
H. Virtual Prime Vendor Activity Logs.	98
I. ATRC Structure	152

1.0 Introduction

This report is for the Year 4 and 5 Cal Poly Demo activities.

1.1 Background and Objectives

As stated in the Foreword, The Cal Poly Demo (Demo) was established to be a research and demonstration manufacturing activity to support the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) and the Defense Supply Center, Philadelphia (DSCP). The DLA's Apparel Research Network (ARN) focus for the Demo included several areas of activity.

The Demo was directed to study the costs and problems associated with the manufacturing of military apparel items. The Demo factory activity was required to produce commercial as well as military products to meet the DLA objective of shared production. Since the Southern California apparel industry is primarily small businesses producing low volume fashion products, the Cal Poly Demo factory needed to reflect the size and capability of its customer audience to be a credible demonstration to industry. In addition, the DSCP was having difficulty placing certain low volume products on contract with commercial producers. Thus, the Cal Poly Demo factory chose to specialize in producing and studying relatively low volume products.

At the time the Demo activity started in 1995 the DSCP had very few West Coast companies amongst their vendors. The Demo worked very actively during Year 3 to recruit apparel businesses on the West Coast to become military contractors for the DSCP. Results were very positive and DLA program management agreed to closure of the activity at the beginning of Year 4 (Spring 1999).

The Demo was charged with transfer of information about the Demo activity to industry. The DLA was interested in communicating the lessons learned at the Demo that benefited both military and commercial production in the Demo factory as well as industry at large. Working with an industry advisory committee (Coalition) was key to transferring information as well as developing support from industry for the Demo activity.

The Demo continued its involvement in the DLA/DSCP initiative of Virtual Prime Vendor. This project area was dedicated to making improvements in the government Clothing and Textile supply chain through total asset visibility, changes in the ordering and manufacturing activities to a "balanced flow" operational scenario, and significant inventory reduction.

Lastly, at the end of this report appears a summary of the "lessons learned" in operating an activity of this size and type over the two-year option contract period. This section documents areas other than specific programmatic activities.

This report documents both programmatic and general tasks associated with operating the demonstration activity during Years 4 and 5 of the contract.

1.2 Scope and Methodology

This report covers the Year 4 and 5 time period of December 1, 1998 through November 30, 2000. In addition, three separate garment reports and a separate Virtual Prime Vendor report also cover part of this time period.

"Lessons learned" at the end of this report are documented as a result of experiences or issues and their associated resolutions in performing government contract work. These cover from 12/01/98 - 11/30/00.

A glossary of terms and acronyms appears as Appendix A.

2.0 Manufacturing Activity

2.1 Introduction

The Cal Poly Demonstration factory was responsible for studying all aspects of military garment production while also producing commercial items in the same production facility. The desired outcome for this "shared production" environment was that lessons learned in producing commercial items would hopefully benefit military item production and vice versa.

Specific issues affecting the military garments of the Marine men's short sleeve dress shirt, the Marine maternity dress uniform (tunic, slack and skirt) and the maternity Battle Dress Uniform that occurred during Years 1 through 4 are documented in separate reports. These reports are posted on the Apparel Research Network (ARN) web site at <http://arn.iitri.org>. This report includes additional issues on these items that occurred during Years 4 and 5.

During Years 4 and 5 the Demo factory continued to produce a variety of both military and commercial products in a modular manufacturing system. The Demo challenged itself by working with a variety of casual sportswear items and military items that were all small lots of between 600 - 1200 units on average. Some products required sewing labor only and some products were full package projects including sourcing, patternwork, spreading, cutting, bundling, sewing and finishing. The goal was to determine if the Demo could be successful with smaller lot manufacturing, be a credible demonstration to industry and at the same time meet the cash match requirements of the contract while achieving a break even financial status. This combination proved to be very difficult to achieve for several reasons.

Some of the specific challenges and issues concerning the manufacturing activity included:

- 1) additional manufacturing issues related to military items,
- 2) lessons learned regarding quality problems in two Coast Guard shirts,
- 3) common problems in manufacturing military items,
- 4) implementation of a new quality system,
- 5) success as a credible manufacturing demonstration
- 6) improvement of the manufacturing infrastructure, and
- 7) meeting cash match requirements while achieving a break even financial status.

A list of 33 commercial customers and their products produced during Year 4 and 5 can be found in Appendix B.

2.2 Additional Manufacturing Issues Related to Military Items

Major issues in manufacturing the items below are listed here. Details of other smaller production issues can be found in the daily activity logs in Appendix D.

2.2.1 Marine Men's Short Sleeve Dress Shirt

From the time the Demo started producing the Marine short sleeve shirt in 1997, the factory staff had difficulty with setting the collar, as the collar neckline seam was 1-5/8" longer than the corresponding neckline seam on the yoke. During Year 4 Demo staff asked DSCP staff to review this problem. Great difficulty was encountered in reaching resolution in a timely manner for the Demo factory. After many months it was finally determined that this was due to Demo staff and DSCP staff having different perspectives on the amount of handling that should be needed to produce the shirt. Demo staff members were applying the same procedures and techniques used on the other commercial shirts produced in the Demo factory. DSCP staff members were using several additional handling and pressing steps that Demo staff were not. Once this was determined and a change was made in the collar interlining to a softer fusible product, the problem was resolved.

Please see Appendix D for more information.

2.2.2 Maternity Battle Dress Uniform (BDU) – Coat and Slack

Major production problems were encountered with the government furnished material (gfm) during Year 5. The government decided to change the two BDU items to a contractor furnished material (cfm) for its new solicitation and so the gfm available was the last of the gfm program for these items. The fabric was severely flawed and caused several production delays and difficulties with delivery schedules over a period of several months. The normal method of returning gfm fabric rolls with major defects was not a viable resolution as approximately 77% of the rolls had major problems and this would have been very expensive in addition to halting production. To resolve the problem the DSCP ended up inspecting the fabric at the depot before shipping it to the Demo. This finally resulted in the Demo receiving useable fabric to complete the rest of the contract.

Please see Appendix D for more information.

2.2.3 Marine Maternity Dress Uniform – Tunic, Slack, Skirt, Short Sleeve Shirt and Long Sleeve Shirt

No major production issues were encountered with these items during Years 4 and 5. A sourcing issue proved to be a challenge in finding a supplier for an unusual component in very low volume quantities. The maternity panel in the skirt and slack required a nylon interlock fabric in the khaki green color of the uniform. Nylon interlock is an uncommon fabric in any color and especially unusual as a maternity panel as it has virtually no stretch. Demo staff were finally able to locate a source and custom order the item.

With the Demo contract to produce these items coming to an end in November 2000, the DSCP asked the Demo to identify sources of supply for many of the mil spec trims to facilitate their efforts in getting a commercial contractor capable of producing the same items. The Demo provided information to DSCP staff even after the end of the Year 5 contract.

Please see Appendix D for more information.

2.3 Lessons Learned - Quality Problems in Coast Guard Shirts

At the end of Year 4 the DSCP identified a quality problem they had been having with two Coast Guard shirts. Commercial contractors were not successfully producing shirts that passed the high quality requirements for these garments. It was determined that the Demo manufacturing activity for Year 5 would include an evaluation of these two garments to see if the Demo could pinpoint what the cause of the problems were with the goal of actually producing the items. Demo evaluation revealed that there were problems with the pattern and the specifications. Pattern problems included missing markings, incorrectly made pattern pieces and pattern construction that did not agree with the specifications. The process to work out the problems was very slow, taking from December of 1999 to August of 2000. This included the Demo reviewing the original pattern and specs, providing a list of problems to be resolved by the DSCP and waiting for a revised version of the pattern and specs to review again. The process involved five rounds of pattern/spec review and alteration before the Demo and DSCP felt a quality garment could be produced.

These garments also required sourcing of garment and packaging components not required by other military shirts produced at the Demo. As a result, additional sourcing efforts were necessary for production of samples from the revised patterns.

Please see Appendix D for more information.

2.4 Common Problems in Manufacturing Military Items

Manufacturing of all military items had the same common problems during Years 4 and 5. Information about specific instances can be found in the daily activity logs in Appendix D and in the Cal Poly Demo monthly reports posted on the Apparel Research Network (ARN) web site at <http://arn.iitri.org>. The problems included the following of:

- a) timely receipt of promised delivery orders,
- b) timely receipt of promised contract modifications,
- c) timely response to contract questions,
- d) problems with government paperwork, and
- e) shortages on gfm shipments.

Even though the Demo worked very closely with the Item Managers and Contracting Officers at the DSCP on the contracts for the military items in production, there were several instances of delivery order paperwork not being received by the promised date and as a result a production line would have to be stopped. This was costly to the Demo and the BDU subcontractor.

There were several instances where both the DSCP and the Demo agreed that pattern and/or contract modifications were necessary. When these did not arrive at the promised time it caused problems with production delays and meeting shipping dates.

There were many instances where the Demo needed an answer to an identified problem with paperwork, etc. and there would be a delay of days or weeks before the answer could be secured. This was usually due to the fact that some kind of research with multiple parties at the DSCP had to be completed before an answer could be provided.

Considerable time had to be spent on correcting errors in government documents. As soon as government paperwork was received at the Demo it was reviewed to insure all information was as expected. Corrections were quite often necessary. Additionally, there was variation by the different Item Managers in the requirements to fill out the government DD250 form to receive payment.

All of the military items produced by the Demo and the BDU subcontractor were on government furnished material (gfm) programs. In general, the dress uniform fabrics were of very high quality but the number of yards on a roll on the shipping tag was often higher than the actual yardage received. This

resulted in some production delays and difficulty in meeting shipping delivery dates.

In general, similar type issues to all of the above were usually resolved within a few hours to one day with the commercial customers of the Demo.

2.5 Implementation of a New Quality System

During Year 5 the Demo started a project with a major retailer to implement a standardized quality system both acceptable to the military and commercial sectors. The Military Standard 105E was used as the system. A new Quality Supervisor position was created and a staff person hired to implement the new system. Over time several other staff were trained in the quality system and took active roles in quality audits.

2.6 Success as a Credible Demonstration

While modular manufacturing continued to be the best strategy for producing the smaller lots of varying styles in the Demo factory and industry visitors and questions regarding modular manufacturing continued at a consistently high level, few companies could afford the cost in time and money of actual implementation. The Demo tried to find an innovative way to assist apparel companies in their adoption of modular manufacturing by offering a self-help, how-to class over a three-month period in Year 5. Two companies participated and were very positive about the instruction received but still found it difficult to do the implementation on their own.

The Demo found its success on this point in other ways, specifically the amount of information requested by industry on manufacturing and other industry related topics. See Section 5.3.4 for more information.

2.7 Improvement of the Manufacturing Infrastructure

During Years 4 and 5 the Demo actively pursued means to improve its own internal operations through regular review of its processes, use of tools for documentation and review of job descriptions and responsibilities. This proved to be an ongoing challenge for a small manufacturing activity. Most software tools available in industry were for larger and more sophisticated operations and were not appropriate for a factory the size of the Demo.

The Demo found means of organizing and controlling information in ways that worked well for it and was often asked by other small manufacturers and contractors how it did so. The Demo was pleased with the response it received when information was shared.

2.8 Meeting Cash Match Requirements While Achieving Break Even Financial Status

The DLA Demo activity had a 1:1 cash match requirement in Years 4 and 5. This meant that for every \$1 of DLA funding spent, the Demo was required to match \$1 of independently derived expense either from production of commercially manufactured products, meeting and seminar activities or other industry related activities. There were two principal reasons for this requirement:

1. This requirement meant that Cal Poly had to make a serious commitment to the success of the Demo rather than being a passive recipient of government funding.
2. The requirement encouraged the Demo to develop a self-supporting capability that would make it more credible to the community it was trying to serve while insuring the long-term future of the facility.

The Demo plan to produce the required cash match depended heavily on the Demo factory to generate the bulk of the required level of expenditures. Contractually, the Demo was required to generate cash match activity through additional activities such as workshops and seminars as well.

As a DoD funded R&D activity, the Demo factory was constrained against direct competition with commercial firms. This meant that the Demo could not use traditional means of attracting customers such as advertising, direct mail, etc. As a result, the Demonstration developed a strategy that included educating local industry about the ATRC capabilities through newsletters, articles in local news publications, factory tours and encouraging firms to participate in ATRC activities such as the Coalition, seminars, and military contractor recruitment.

A total of 33 commercial customers for the factory generated over \$887,000 of the required cash match (including both direct and indirect monies). Sixteen of the customers were on-campus organizations demonstrating the commitment of Cal Poly to support the factory. However, the bulk of commercial business came from 17 commercial apparel firms who generated 93% of the factory income. These firms represented a wide range of apparel manufacturers and demonstrated the viability of the commercial manufacturing capabilities of the Demo. Detailed information on products manufactured for the commercial and University customers is listed in Appendix B. Due to the proprietary nature of information on manufacturing done for outside commercial customers, an abbreviated list of products and quantities produced is included.

The combination of factory, seminars and State grant funding exceeded the combined Year 4 and 5 requirements of \$1,000,000 by over \$459,000. Staff worked very hard to meet this requirement.

In the end, the cash match requirement while difficult to achieve, turned out to be less difficult than operating on a break even financial basis. It proved to be far more difficult for a government R & D contract on a University campus to meet the requirement to operate like a business given the programmatic requirements of the contract. See Section 7.3 for more information.

3.0 Hard to Procure Products

3.1 Introduction

Part of the mission of the Demonstration was to provide assistance to the DSCP when it had difficulty placing an item(s) on contract with a commercial producer. The difficulty usually came from the item being low volume and/or unusual in its construction. Assistance to the DSCP took various forms as described below.

3.2 Hard to Procure Items Produced by the Demo Factory

During Year 4 and 5 the Demo factory produced the following products for the DSCP and are reported on in detail in the separate garment reports identified in the Foreword:

- 1) Maternity Battle Dress Uniform (BDU) contract - started Feb. 98
- 2) Marine maternity dress uniform contract- tunic, slack and skirt

The Demo also assisted the DSCP with the production of four items through small purchase orders:

- 1) Marine dress uniform skirts - 2 styles
- 2) Marine maternity shirts - 2 styles

The Marine dress uniform skirts were produced over a four-month period of 9/98 to 1/99 because of immediate sourcing needs. A total of 420 dark blue skirts and 1,620 khaki green skirts were completed. The ATRC tried out another local company as a subcontractor on one of the skirts. The company really struggled with the additional requirements of military contract work.

At the end of Year 3 all the pre-award activity and most of the pre-production activity was completed for the two maternity shirts. Actual production did not take place until the beginning of Year 4.

The ATRC provided costing information to the DSCP on the Marine maternity dress uniform jumper.

3.3 Maternity BDU Contract - Incubator Project

The maternity BDU contract was the one project that had an additional element beyond the production need. The BDU items of coat and slack were

used as part of an incubator project to develop a local producer capable of manufacturing the items directly for the DSCP. A Demo Coalition (industry advisory committee) member who had a long-term interest in doing military contract work was the company chosen to be the incubator participant.

The time frame for the project would be a minimum of 18 - 24 months in length. The company was a sewing contractor and would have to develop the additional in-house capability to become a full package contractor. During the first months of the project, the incubator company focused all its attention on developing its production capability. The Demo completed all patternwork, sourcing, cutting, bundling, shipping and invoicing for the maternity items up through the end of Year 3

Plans for Year 4 included the incubator company assuming the patternwork, sourcing, cutting and bundling tasks. This would require an investment in technology and creation of new positions. In addition, the DSCP would release a full solicitation for the items and the incubator company would respond with a technical proposal. Award of the contract would occur after January 2000. Hopefully, the incubator company would win this award because of their experience with the items.

Results at the end of Year 5 were positive. The Coalition company benefited from the regular production of an item that stayed the same for an extended period of time. The incubator arrangement allowed the company to focus on the production aspects of making the garment before having to deal with the pre-production, sourcing and eventual paperwork requirements of military contract work. The solicitation was released by DSCP in the Fall of 1999 and the incubator company responded with a proposal. The ATRC was called by DSCP in January 2001 for a reference check about the incubator company.

3.4 Summary

The Demo successfully assisted DSCP in the areas of Hard to Procure Products by providing a full range of capabilities including:

1. Full Production Garment Manufacturing
2. Identification, Recruitment and Training of Qualified Subcontractors
3. Costing of Additional Military Garments

Particularly successful was the incubator project, which provided DSCP with not only the product that was needed, but also a new manufacturing resource that DSCP did not previously have. The Demo manufacture of the Marine maternity dress items was so successful that DSCP continued to issue purchase orders for the original three items to the Demo well after the original demonstration was complete and added the two maternity shirts as well.

4.0 Military Contractor Recruitment

4.1 Introduction

The original intention of this activity at the beginning of the base contract in 1995/1996 was to fulfill the contract obligation of assisting the DSCP in generating a supplier base of small West Coast apparel companies that would support military readiness and improve the cost, quality, and delivery of military uniform items to DSCP customers.

Recruitment efforts by the ATRC involved familiarizing companies of the benefits of becoming a military contractor, such as an increase in their sales and the potential for repeat business. Efforts by the ATRC were so successful that DLA-PM and DSCP personnel agreed the goal of the activity had been achieved and the decision was made to close the activity in March of 1999.

4.2 Results

In 1996, recruitment efforts were small due to the start up process as well as the staff's limited knowledge in military contracting. Due to an increase in marketing, 1997 results more than doubled over 1996. In 1998 and 1999, the apparel industry, now aware of the presence of the ATRC and its credibility, increased their interest in military contracting. As a result of two seminars and one workshop for industry, 17 CAGE codes were issued and another 9 were pending at the time the activity ceased in March of 1999. In addition, the following also occurred:

	Packets Disbursed	Applications sent by ATRC	Applications Sent by Company
Total	223	26	5

One of the ATRC Coalition members became a military subcontractor through an incubator project with the ATRC for the production of the maternity BDU items. See Section 3.3 for additional information.

Even though this activity was officially closed in the Spring of '99, the Demo staff continued to provide information to companies who contacted the Demo about military contracting.

5.0 Information Dissemination to and Interaction with Industry

5.1 Introduction

The Demo developed and distributed information on advanced apparel manufacturing and technology as well as services provided by the Demo to accomplish its technology transfer mission and generate the cash match requirement. The media used to accomplish this task included the ATRC newsletter, web site, publications and tours. Additionally, the ATRC Coalition, an industry advisory group, was a mechanism by which the apparel pipeline gathered to share information, develop and actively work on projects important to the industry. And lastly, the ATRC actively engaged in interaction with industry groups/associations, donors of equipment and supplies, vendors and customers. This section reports on these efforts.

5.2 Information Provided to Industry

5.2.1 Newsletter

The ATRC newsletter was developed in the Spring of 1996 to provide information to the apparel community on the objectives and activities of the ATRC. Some of the topics covered in the newsletter were:

- ATRC Activities
- Coalition News
- Educational Opportunities
- News from the Factory
- The Source
- Military Contracting
- Seminar and Workshop Offerings

The newsletter was published in January '99, March '99, September '99, December '99, and July '00 and was distributed to approximately 9,000 organizations involved in the apparel industry. It was also available on the ATRC web site. The newsletter has contributed to industry awareness of the ATRC. There was a noticeable increase in inquiries to the Center after each publication.

Additionally, a special one-time Coalition newsletter and a separate Donor newsletter was published for these selected groups.

5.2.2 Web Site

The ATRC Web Site was established during 1996. Based on the growth of the ATRC and information learned about the needs of the ATRC's user community the web site was completely redesigned and expanded during 1998.

The ATRC website includes the pages of:

- Articles
- Calendar of Events
- Coalition
- Factory
- History
- Links
- Location
- Newsletter
- Services Offered
- Studies/Reports
- "The Source"
- What's New

Pages were updated with new information as deemed appropriate.

Through the website the Center received on-line requests for ATRC-specific information as well as requests for general information about the industry.

"The Source" resource database resides on the ATRC website and is explained in further detail in Section 5.2.9 of this document.

The ATRC Web Site is <http://atrc.age.csupomona.edu> .

5.2.3 Information Packets/Brochures/Flyers

As a means to disseminate information about the ATRC and its services, packets, brochures and flyers were developed and maintained.

- Information packets were mailed to individuals as requested or as a means to pique interest in the Center.
- Flyers were distributed to the campus community concerning products available through the Center.
- Pocket-sized brochures were developed and printed to substitute for information packets when possible.
- Oversized "business card" brochures were developed to feature highlights of the Center in a cost effective format.

The printed materials above helped explain what the ATRC was about to interested companies and as a result the Demo factory oftentimes obtained work. Several companies visited the Center as a result of receiving requested information.

5.2.4 Publications and Presentations

In an effort to make the apparel industry aware of the ATRC and its services, publicity and presentations were used as an important tool.

A total of 15 articles in seven different newspapers and magazines were published about the Center or included ATRC experts among those interviewed for the article. A list of the published articles appears in Appendix D. The volume of incoming calls and tours usually increased after a major article had been published.

A total of 13 presentations about the Center and apparel manufacturing were given to a variety of organizations both in and out of the apparel industry. A list appears in Appendix E.

The Center was a featured segment in the PBS program "California Heartland" on February 13, 1999. ATRC staff was asked to tape a segment on the apparel pipeline in a video for a Freudenberg National Sales Meeting. Professor Jean Gipe provided information for and reviewed a chapter for a new textbook on apparel manufacturing, Fashion for Profit.

5.2.5 Wall Visuals

These were developed and displayed to visually describe what occurs at the demonstration site factory. These were updated in Years 4 and 5 to include such items as:

- Completed apparel items - displayed in the factory and in the conference room
- Pictures of visitors on tour - on walls in the office area hallway and foyer

5.2.6 Tours/Contacts with Industry

During Years 4 and 5, the ATRC demonstration site factory provided first-time tours to 314 individuals from the apparel industry and general public. (Neither return visits nor other non-apparel visitors are included.) For a breakdown of the number of those touring the Center, along with related percentages, see below:

Type	Amount	Percentage
Contractor/Manufacturer	167	53%
Other apparel-related (Retailer, Service Provider, Supplier, Textile)	96	30%
General public	42	14%
Government-related	9	3%
Totals	314	100%

5.2.7 Education Activities

Educational activities at the ATRC during Years 4 and 5 included seminars, workshops, demonstrations and industry panel activities. Most seminars and workshops were for a fee but the demonstration and panel activities were at no charge to the attendees.

During Years 4 and 5 ATRC staff used the ATRC Coalition and requests from industry to determine both the topics and course content for a seminar and workshop schedule. Even though the seminars and workshops were heavily advertised, only twelve had sufficient sign-ups to be held and they were:

• Military Contracting	-	02/99	held
• Today's Interlinings	-	03/99	held
• Understanding Sewing Thread	-	05/99	held
• Lectra Upholstery User's Conference	-	06/99	held
• The Internet (Where to Start)	-	06/99	
• Does the State Still Owe You Money	-	06/99	
• Full Package Contracting	-	09/99	held
• Product Costing	-	10/99	held
• Time Study/Work Measurement	-	01/00	
• Modular Manufacturing	-	01/00	held
• Establishing Standards	-	02/00	
• Methods Engineering	-	03/00	
• Product Costing	-	03/00	
• Self-Guided Business Assessment	-	04/00	
• Quality Assurance Programs	-	04/00	held
• Quality Assurance Programs	-	05/00	held
• Quality Assurance Programs	-	06/00	held
• Worksite Wellness Programs/	-	07/00	held

E-Commerce Websites

- Quality Assurance Programs - 09/00 held
- Standards Development on the Fly - 10/00
- Product Development for Full Package Capability - 10/00
- Product Costing - 11/00
- How to Start an Apparel Business - 11/00

The seminar and workshop attendees completed evaluations and they included very positive remarks. Attendance at the seminars and workshops was as low as 2 and as high as 50. The ATRC staff was disappointed that attendance was not better and asked many industry contacts why. Most indicated that in small businesses, as the bulk of apparel businesses in California are, it is very difficult to get away for this kind of activity.

The ATRC hosted/conducted six demonstrations of factory floor equipment and software for Lectra, Durkopp Adler and Autometrix potential customers.

The ATRC in conjunction with its advisory committee, the Coalition, held three industry panel educational activities. They were:

- Retailer-Manufacturer Interaction - 09/99
- Speed is Life - 05/00
- Opportunities in Full Package Contracting - 10/00

The panel activities were paid for by a total of 13 Coalition sponsors and were then advertised to industry at no cost. Six to eight experts from a variety of types of companies throughout the apparel pipeline were asked to share their views and knowledge on the above topics. These activities turned out to be very successful in both attendance (20-23 each) and evaluation comments about content.

5.2.8 Training

- During Year 5 effort was expended in the further investigation of possible opportunities for apparel companies to benefit from the Employment Training Panel (ETP). ETP is a source of monies from the State Unemployment Insurance Fund for upgrade training of employees at manufacturing businesses. Since the apparel industry in California is so large, it is a major contributor to this fund but to date had had little exposure to this funding opportunity. ETP changed some of its eligibility requirements that made the program user-friendlier for small apparel companies. Meetings were held with Wally Aguilar from the Employment Training Panel but the information shared did not prove to be workable for the ATRC to pursue.

- During Year 5 effort was also expended to investigate the Welfare to Work (WtW) program for training dollars for apparel companies. Meetings were held with Shirley Hassel and other WtW staff but the program's structure did not facilitate guiding potential trainees into apparel occupational training.

5.2.9 "The Source"

"The Source" is an on-line sourcing database guide for the apparel industry, which was requested by the ATRC Coalition. Free enrollments were offered to Coalition members, apparel associations, and ATRC vendors/suppliers as well as industry-at-large. This was done in an attempt to get non-computer oriented apparel businesses up on the Internet.

35 companies had listed with "The Source" at the end of Year 3 in November 1998. During Years 4 and 5 another 37 companies were put into "The Source" database.

Initial efforts to use this as a cash-match endeavor were unsuccessful but demo staff felt that, although this effort takes time, it would eventually be a source of income for the ATRC and help the industry.

5.3 Interaction with Industry

5.3.1 Coalition

The Coalition is comprised of executives from all areas of the apparel industry. The members of the Coalition in conjunction with ATRC staff determined visionary projects that served the best interests of industry.

During Years 4 and 5, it was the goal of the ATRC and the current Coalition members to:

- restructure
- identify and perform services industry needs

All were interested in the group being more of a working group than an advisory group. The ATRC Coalition held its own events and meetings. They included:

- Coalition meetings
- 7 Coalition Steering Committee meetings

It also sponsored the following events for the benefit of industry:

- 3 Industry events of an Industry Mixer, Golf Tournament and Dinner
- 3 Industry Panel educational activities

Coalition goals were met and accomplished in the following ways.

5.3.1.1 Restructure

During Year 4 and most of Year 5 the Coalition met every two or three months to work on their committee activities. These committees were Retail Interaction, Service to Industry and Education. Each committee identified someone to act as a "chair" person. An ATRC representative acted as the committee facilitator. The Coalition proved very successful as proven by the member's attendance, active participation and enthusiasm within their committees. Members were willing to work on their projects outside of the committee meetings to meet their objectives. Towards the end of Year 5, the decision was made to include short educational presentations on topics of interest to Coalition members at the beginning of each meeting.

5.3.1.2 Identify and Perform Services Industry Needs

The three committees within the Coalition all worked to identify the needs of the apparel industry.

- Retail Interaction - Developed agendas to create communications between the retailer and other areas of the apparel pipeline.

This committee sponsored three Industry Panel educational activities.

See 5.2.7 for details.

- Service to Industry - This committee worked on projects to benefit the industry and the ATRC.

This committee was interested in and began work on standardizing forms used in apparel manufacturing such as cutting tickets, specification sheets, etc. This work was not completely finished at the time the Demonstration project was terminated at the end of Year 5. This committee also assisted the ATRC with events for industry such as the Industry Mixer in July '99 and the Golf Tournament and Seminar/Dinner in September '99.

- Education – This committee assisted ATRC staff with review of course content of planned seminars and workshops as well as evaluation of potential for implementation of State-funded training programs.

5.3.2 Increase Vendor/Customer/Donor Relationships

The ATRC staff has worked hard to maintain and continually improve relations with vendors, customers and donors.

These efforts were accomplished in the following ways:

- The ATRC completes paperwork to the University when a gift was received. The University and the ATRC acknowledged these gifts by sending letters of appreciation.
- A newsletter with "extra" news for the vendors and donors who support the ATRC was mailed.
- A second Vendor Appreciation Lunch was planned and scheduled for September 2000 but was cancelled due to vendor scheduling conflicts.

The success of these efforts is proven by the donations of equipment and supplies, repeat business for the factory and referrals for information and tours that the ATRC received. This has included a new CAD system, digitizer, cutter, fuser, label printer, needle and thread donations.

5.3.3 Develop Relationships with Industry and Support Organizations

The ATRC staff attended various events and meetings to develop and maintain relationships with industry and other support organizations. ATRC staff made an effort to create a high level of visibility in industry for the Center and as a result ATRC staff attended many industry functions as invited guests.

5.3.3.1 Industry Organizations

ATRC staff attended 19 special industry events, 15 industry meetings and had a booth at five trade shows during Years 4 and 5. Additionally, 5 meetings with other industry organizations were held to explore partnering opportunities. Many new contacts were made and previous acquaintances renewed through these activities.

5.3.3.2 Support Organizations

The ATRC attended or hosted 24 meetings with representatives from 13 support organizations outside the apparel industry. These were Federal, State and local government offices as well as economic development organizations. Discussions focused on better understanding of what each organization offered

in the way of support to industry and how the ATRC might be able to partner with each organization more effectively. These meetings benefited industry, as the ATRC staff was able to direct industry inquiries to the appropriate resource or office more readily.

5.3.4 Service and Assistance to the Apparel Industry

As a result of receipt of a State grant in April of 2000, the ATRC started tracking the service and assistance the ATRC provided to apparel companies. Requests for information were in such areas as:

- Technical information
- Business information
- Recommendations for placing production
- Recommendations for sourcing
- Military contracting information
- Workshop and seminar schedules
- A wide variety of other miscellaneous apparel industry topics

Requests were received by phone, e-mail, the website and visitors on tour. A total of a little over 300 requests were received in an 8-month period. (Note: If a conservative estimate of 35 requests per month occurred during the entire 24 month period this would have added up to over 800 requests by industry for help.) If the ATRC could not directly provide the requested information, it found a resource for the inquirer that could answer its question.

5.3.5 Service to the Apparel Merchandising and Management degree (AMM) and the University

The AMM degree at Cal Poly prepares students for retail and manufacturing management positions in the apparel industry. The ATRC provides an opportunity for the degree students to learn more about apparel manufacturing. In an effort to coordinate and bring together the efforts of the DoD-DLA, private industry, the AMM degree at Cal Poly and the University in general, the following occurred during Years 4 and 5 to support university activities:

- Fourteen tours were given to visiting dignitaries including the Consul General of China, the new Secretary for the California Trade and Commerce Agency, and a California State Assemblyman.
- Seventeen tours were given to entire classes or students in either the AMM or other campus degree programs.
- Several individuals were referred to the degree program that became aware of the degree program through the ATRC.

- Four students were hired from various degree programs on campus to assist with ATRC activities.
- Nine tours were given to University departments and/or individuals.
- Thirteen tours were given to individuals and groups from other schools and universities, six of which were from international institutions of higher learning.
- ATRC staff served on five Foundation or University committees and worked at two Foundation or University events.

5.4 Develop GoldMine Database and Document Interaction

All the various contacts made with industry have been added to the Demo's GoldMine software database. The database is to be used by all areas of the ATRC to keep information concerning contacts with companies as well as to inform those companies about the Center's resources and expertise.

The database started Year 4 with approximately 8,000 companies/individuals listed. By the end of Year 5 the database had grown to approximately 9,000 records. Additionally, the existing records are constantly being updated.

6.0 Virtual Prime Vendor

6.1 Introduction

In March 1997, the DLA/DSCP supply chain initiative, Virtual Prime Vendor (VPV), was developed and assigned as part of the Demo work.

The first major task of the Demo was to work with the retail customer, Marine Corp Recruit Depot - San Diego (MCRD-SD), to develop a new inventory and order management system. The new system was to give San Diego and the DLA/DSCP total asset visibility of the clothing inventory status as well as migrate San Diego to new business rules in its ordering habits. Instead of few large orders over a year's time, the clothing operation would order on a "balanced flow" of smaller, more frequent orders that were more reflective of the seasonality of their business. As part of the VPV process, San Diego would work towards a substantial inventory reduction.

Additionally, investigation of a new system for the Army Recruit Training Center of Ft. Leonard Wood in Missouri was completed in the Fall of 1998.

Complete documentation of the MCRD - SD and Ft. Leonard Wood activity from March 1997 to the Fall of 1999 are documented in the ARN research report of VPVT1P1 which can be found on the ARN web site at <http://arn.iitri.org>.

Overall, the project realized the desired results for both San Diego and the Virtual Prime Vendor initiative.

During Years 4 and 5 the Cal Poly Demo focused on follow on work with the retail activity at MCRD - SD and started new work in the manufacturing part of the DLA supply chain. The Demo worked closely with Product Data Integration Technologies, Inc. (PDIT) personnel and the tools PDIT developed for VPV to complete the following tasks:

- ASAPWeb tool development for the Defense Apparel Manufacturers (DAMs)
- Assisting DAMs with ASAPWeb implementation
- AAVS DataMart
- VIM Site
- Other software applications
- Miscellaneous tasks

A description of work and activities in each area follows.

6.2 ASAPWeb Tool Development

The ASAPWeb tool was the means by which the DSCP would have visibility into the manufacturing base's inventory. This task was focused on the manufacturing activity in the supply chain and was intended to assist in the total asset visibility objective.

The tool was first implemented and tested in the demonstration factory to identify and correct as many functionality problems as possible before implementation with actual defense manufacturers. The original intent was to develop a tool where the manufacturers would report their work in process and finished goods inventories. As the tool was used by the Cal Poly Demo, it was determined additional features such as an electronic DD250 capability would increase the usefulness of the tool and the likelihood that the manufacturers would use the tool more successfully.

ASAPWeb tool development tasks were completed with PDIT and included:

- Preliminary and final testing of the electronic DD250 from PDIT using Cal Poly data
- Finalizing v.1.4/1.5 of ASAPWeb and the electronic DD250
- Resolve problems and issues related to full implementation of the electronic DD250 including resolving issues with DFAS, WInS and DLIS
- Setting up user accounts and passwords for appropriate CP personnel, training in use of tool, making corrections and updates over time
- Testing printer capabilities of the electronic DD250 and working with PDIT to resolve problems
- Development of "special orders" capability in ASAPWeb
- Corrections to inaccurate information in Cal Poly contract files including incorrect Ship To address, Administered By info, Acceptance Point info, TCN# placement, Shipped From info, CLINS listed, Payment Made By, Ship To, Unit Pack numbers
- Issues and problems related to erroneous issuance of a second CAGE code for Cal Poly, repeat all previous work completed
- Set up of Cal Poly ATRC as an "affiliation" so the ship from address would be ATRC instead of Cal Poly Foundation
- Development of ASAPWeb shipping labels for the interior of cartons
- Development of ASAPWeb shipping labels for the exterior of cartons
- Resolve problem with edit function not working properly on the electronic DD250
- Resolve problem of Shipment information on DD250 in Block #2 for final shipment requiring a Z at the end of the shipment number
- Resolve problem of prefix required on DD250 in Block #2 for shipment info

- Create template for Block #23 - Contractor Use
- Resolve price discrepancy problems and discount terms in ASAPWeb
- Correct problem with duplicate NSNs in SAMMS
- Resolve error message problem in ASAPWeb
- How to use ASAPWeb to generate pick tickets
- Tracking payment timelines for DD250s submitted electronically through ASAPWeb through the Vendor Pay Site for electronic funds transfer
- Modify design of "Finish" button in DD250
- Learn WAWF as part of the electronic DD250 submission process

The CP VIM and factory staff successfully completed this activity.

6.3 ASAPWeb Implementation at the DAMs

Cal Poly was assigned to work with various Defense Apparel Manufacturers (DAMs) in their implementation of the ASAPWeb tool. The DAMs were to report their Work-In-Process (WIP) and Finished Goods (FG) inventories in ASAPWeb to create asset visibility for the DSCP.

The Cal Poly list of DAMs changed during Years 4 and 5 and included the following companies:

- American Apparel
- Apparel Manufacturing
- Capps Shoe Co.
- Caribbean Needle Point, Inc.
- Choctaw Mfg. Co.
- Coastal Enterprises of Jacksonville Fla.
- Crown Clothing
- DeRossi
- EA Edcar
- Equa Industries, Inc.
- Goodwill Industries of South Florida
- Jockey International
- J.H. Rutter-Rex
- Lajas Industries, Inc
- M.J. Soffee Co.
- National Industries for the Blind
- North Bay Rehabilitation Services
- NYSARC Inc.
- Olympic Mills Corp.
- Peckham Vocational Industries
- Proper International, Inc.

- SAMCO
- STEPS, Inc.
- Talladega Industries for the Blind
- Travis Association for the Blind
- Unicor
- Union Underwear Co.
- Wolverine Worldwide, Inc.

Cal Poly worked with almost all of the companies to get them to report WIP and FG. CP worked more actively with MJ Soffee, SAMCO and Apparel Mfg. and actually completed work up through electronic DD250 submission with these companies.

Tasks completed with the above companies included the following:

- Setting up ASAPWeb user accounts and passwords, working with the DAM and the user's manual, providing general help and answering questions, adding to the question and answer page for ASAPWeb
- Assistance with entering and updating WIP and FG information and Bill and Hold information
- Assistance with how to use the FTP for automated upload of WIP and FG information to the ASAPWeb server
- Setting up WInS accounts
- Assisting with use of the ASAPWeb demo site so employees can learn the tool
- Setting up printers and browsers to be able to use ASAPWeb, resolving font issues at the DAM for printing DD250s
- Resolving issues related to one manufacturer having more than one CAGE code
- Resolving issues of extended price printed on the electronic DD250
- Problems related to adding or deleting an NSN on the electronic DD250
- Resolving incorrect contract data so ASAPWeb screens are correct
- Resolving issues of adding and deleting PGC items
- Determining need for multiple affiliations to enter separate information for one prime contractor
- Submitted DD250s disappearing from the WInS system
- Resolution of price discrepancies between contracts and AAVS DataMart information
- Resolution of need for shipping cost recovery special CLIN lines to be added to the DD250
- Need for the manufacturer to enter QAR (quality) information on the DD250
- Identifying issues related to difficulties with MOCAS contracts in the WInS system

Many of the manufacturers were openly resentful of the contract requirement to report their WIP and FG inventories and did not readily cooperate with the Cal Poly VIM. For those that could see the benefits of the electronic DD250 capability work proceeded with less difficulty. Most companies were very inexperienced in computer and Internet skills and struggled with the requirements. Several commented Cal Poly VIM assistance was greatly needed and appreciated.

6.4 AAVS DataMart

Work with the AAVS DataMart included the tasks of:

- Monitoring appropriate transfer of information from QLM to the AAVS DataMart
- Evaluation of accuracy, completeness and appropriateness of information in the DataMart for evaluating inventory activity at MCRD-SD
- Evaluation of accuracy, completeness and appropriateness of information in the DataMart for use in the ASAPWeb activity for Cal Poly and the DAMs

6.5 VIM Site

The VIM tool was the means by which the DSCP would have visibility into the total system. This task was focused on the wholesale activity in the supply chain and was intended to assist in the total asset visibility objective.

VIM tool development tasks were completed with PDIT, Advantech and other VPV partners and included:

- Definition of VIM requirements
- Exploration of the ability to make corrections to incorrect information in the AAVS DataMart through the VIM screens
- Use of the VIM screens to see DAM entries of WIP and FG inventories

6.6 Other Software Applications

During Year 4, the Cal Poly VIM worked with, tracked and monitored the use of the new QLM retail management system at the Marine Corp Recruit Depot – San Diego (MCRD-SD). Tasks included:

- Tracking stock outages and tracing their causes
- Monitoring Order Ship Times for “A” list bag issue items

- Monitoring inventory levels at the 32nd St. Annex for "A" list bag issue items
- Tracking of selected PGC items for order frequency and size in relation to the previous year
- Monitoring drawdown status of inventory at MCRD-SD against planned reductions

Considerable time was spent learning and working with the WInS system as part of the electronic DD250 submission process.

The Cal Poly VIM learned and worked with the BIFRS-W software on and off over Years 4 and 5. Time was spent whenever Clemson Apparel Research (CAR) had something new for the Cal Poly VIM to look at.

The Cal Poly VIM spent time learning the existing and improved DAMES system for Bill and Hold orders.

6.7 Miscellaneous VPV Tasks

Additional VPV tasks included:

- Assisting companies with acquisition of multiple CAGE codes
- Investigating the potential to use scanners to upload WIP and FG inventories into ASAPWeb
- Preliminary study of the new QLM Central system at Ft. Leonard Wood

Overall, the Cal Poly Demo made significant contribution to the VPV program during Years 4 and 5 in the manufacturing part of VPV. Detailed daily activity logs were kept during Year 5 for the above VPV tasks and are in Appendix G.

More information about the Apparel Research Network Virtual Prime Vendor Initiative is available on the ARN web site at <http://arn.iitri.org>.

7.0 Operation of a Demonstration Project - Lessons Learned

7.1 Introduction

A project of the scope and size of the Demonstration activity involved the management of a large staff (30 - 40), a large facility (approx. 10,000 sq. ft.), a large budget (\$3.8 million over two years), and an extensive program of work (seven major areas) within a University setting. There were many unanticipated twists and turns in the operation of the Demonstration project that are documented here as "lessons learned". These "lessons" address more general, operational areas than the specific program of work areas in the previous parts of the report.

A challenge that affected every aspect of the project was communication. The Demo was programmatically and fiscally accountable to the DLA Program Manager, DSCP members of the DLA ARN Joint Planning Committee (JPC), the University and the University's Foundation on an ongoing basis. Each entity had its own requirements and priorities, some of which were not compatible with others. Many activities and tasks were fragmented amongst multiple participants. Logistically, there was a daily challenge trying to make sure all concerned parties were aware of appropriate information and that all parties understood the total demands placed on the Demo staff. Additionally, the Demo was trying to develop activities of interest to industry and build a commercial customer base so as to be financially self-sustaining. Commercial industry functions very differently from the four entities above.

See Appendix H for organizational charts of the ARN and Demo activities.

7.2 Staffing

Staffing continued to present some significant challenges during Years 4 and 5. As the activity evolved it was difficult to create job titles and advertise positions that were readily recognizable by potential job applicants. As a result, some hires were a good fit to the actual job and others were not, resulting in some terminations. Additionally, the performance-based nature of the contract resulted in shifts in the actual work of the contract. Staff had to be flexible as several were moved into positions with very different responsibilities than what they were originally hired to do.

The nature of the demonstration work required staff with higher level skills than the budget could afford. This presented a challenge in trying to bring

staff up to a higher level of capability and having to utilize consulting when that was not possible.

The key staff position responsible for supervising the demonstration factory proved to be the most difficult to fill. This position required a very unique set of skills and abilities not typical of traditional plant manager positions. This included the ability to conduct research, generate technical reports, and transfer that information to industry.

The full operational level of \$1.9 million per year required the Demo to operate with 43 positions. Substantial time and effort had to be devoted to personnel paperwork and at times seemed very disproportionate to the purpose the paperwork served.

7.3 Business Plan

The University decided during the fourth year of the contract to require ATRC staff to complete a business plan before proceeding with Year 5. Since no ATRC staff had sufficient experience in this area, outside assistance was needed to do the business plan. The business plan activity had to be completed within one month.

Budgets were developed and approved to manage the overall Demo activity at a minimum of break-even. The business plan was very helpful during the operation of Year 5.

7.4 Budget Balancing Issues/Cash Match Requirement

As stated previously, the cash match requirement while difficult to achieve, turned out to be less difficult than operating on a required break even financial basis. It proved to be far more difficult for a government R & D contract on a University campus to operate like a business given the programmatic requirements of the contract.

At the end of Year 3 the CP Demo had ramped up to an operational level of \$2 million a year (with \$1 million coming from DLA). This level was required to meet both programmatic and cash match obligations. In Years 4 and 5 DLA funding was reduced by \$500,000/year but the Demo still had to maintain almost the same operational level to meet total contract performance requirements in Years 4 and 5. To achieve an operational level of \$1.9 million each year the Demo had to offset the loss of government income by earning excess cash match income, State grant income and government production work income. The Demo worked diligently to generate the required total level of funding through a variety of resources so as to be self-supporting and fiscally

responsible. During Year 5 the overall Demo had operated at the required break-even level through the end of August 2000.

Budgetary allocations prior to 9/00 were as follows:

- a. Work for DLA - DLA Demo requirements for contract performance included a wide range of tasks and staffing competencies in multiple areas. This included extensive work in the testing of the VPV tools, complete full package capability on the manufacturing floor, and substantial administrative support in the areas of budget, personnel, operations, and reporting. DLA funding in Year 5 covered an average of 50% of the management staff salaries and 40% of 5 of 25 operator's salaries to complete this work. The balance of the expenses for these positions had to be covered by other income of \$690,000.
- b. Cash Match/Industry Work - The cash match/industry work activity of commercial production, workshops/seminars, and industry work (State grant) generated enough income to cover its own expenses of \$732,000. At the end of Year 5 the CP Demo's overall cash match/work for industry activity was successful in being at break even. It was not possible to cover the balance of expenses from work for the DLA due to the following:
 - Available commercial production work does not require the same high overhead level of factory staffing capability as the military full package requirement and the DLA contract requirements. Demo staffing to complete military demo work is at a minimum level and cannot be reduced.
 - Additionally, commercial income, because of the low margins and competitive environment locally and offshore, can only support its own direct expenses and overhead.
 - Inability of the Demo to actively advertise for work without risking the appearance of competition with its own customer base. The ATRC had had a problem with this in the past and was very sensitive to this issue.
 - The total production capability of the factory was relatively small.
- c. Work for DSCP - The Demo completed production for the DSCP as both a service to the DSCP and as a DLA contract activity. The military production work for the DSCP required the same kind of positions and fixed expenses as the DLA contract and provided the means to support the balance of the DLA required positions.

- d. The total budget was in balance and at break even as long as a continuing level of military production occurred each month.

Effects of budgetary changes in 9/00 were as follows:

- a. Government production work during Years 4 and 5 was scheduled to end during Year 5. The pursuit of replacement government production work during the first 9 months of Year 5 did not result in an award. An alternate proposal to PM in 9/00 for other military production was not accepted. Without continuing military production (or other full package work) absorbing the remaining DLA related fixed overhead and with no alternative sources of additional income, the Demo had to determine the best means to cover these costs.
- b. To control potential end of the year financial losses due to reduced military production income, the Foundation and the University determined immediate action at the end of September was necessary to reduce expenses.
- c. It was determined that personnel cutbacks that would affect completion of DLA or DSCP work were not an option. Since the cash match dollar requirement for Year 5 was met in August of 2000, it was determined that a shift of use of funds in the "Cash Match/Industry Work" area would have to be the means to cover the remaining fixed costs. This area was downsized and some adjustments were made in related administrative support.

With the loss of the replacement government work, the Demo needed to reduce staff to maintain financial viability. This action was not received favorably by DLA-PM.

7.5 Institutional Infrastructure Support

The Cal Poly Pomona Foundation, Inc. handles all grants and contracts, awarded to Cal Poly University Pomona. Foundation systems handled personnel, payroll, accounting, and etc. functions. Since these functions were not in-house to the Demo activity, continuing issues of Foundation systems and methods not being compatible with certain "business" activities of the Demonstration persisted throughout the contract period. Foundation systems were set-up to service grants and the Demo was not operated as a grant. The Demo had to develop its own internal systems to compensate for what the Foundation was unable to provide.

7.6 Support from the Technology Vendors

Support from the technology vendors, in general, was excellent. Vendors consistently provided the needed equipment for the factory floor when asked. The Demo wanted to increase the involvement of the vendors with the Demo by providing services to the vendors. These services included display and distribution of vendor literature and hosting vendor guests and activities. Few were interested. Demo staff were disappointed that enhanced two-way relationships did not develop.

7.7 Response from Industry

The bulk of the California apparel manufacturing businesses are companies of less than 50 people that use little of the available advanced technology and manufacturing processes that benefit larger companies.

The ATRC and many other interested parties have attempted to identify services that would assist California companies in upgrading the potential of these businesses. Many factors have limited the success of previous attempts. Ethnic/language issues, company size, lack of exposure to technical information, the low volume nature of the fashion business, the high proportion of single service contracting shops, and the difficulty in attracting new sewing operators to the industry have all affected the results of previous efforts.

While many in industry came to see what the Demo was doing in its model factory, few were able to envision how to afford to do the same with modular manufacturing and advanced technology. Educational efforts were only moderately successful due to a basic lack of understanding by industry of where opportunities for improvement through education were applicable to their business.

On the positive side, there have been many well-known and successful companies who view the activities of the Demo critical to the future success of industry. These companies have supported and been active participants in Demo activities through donations and/or serving as members of the Coalition.

7.9 Reporting Requirements

Reporting continued to be a substantial component of the Demo contract requirements. Because of the size and scope of the DLA Demo, ATRC staff needed to devote extensive hours to the reporting requirement. It was often difficult for the staff to see the reporting requirement as anything other than an obstacle to completing other required tasks.

7.9 Overall Management

The nature of the Demo work as a research and demonstration facility was always an evolving activity both in the nature of the work as well as the means to accomplish the work. This presented many challenges in staffing and organizational structure.

One of the concepts of the manufacturing part of the Demo was to operate "best practices" both on the shop floor and above the shop floor. As work evolved and changed and "lessons learned" evaluated, some innovative approaches to handling Demo requirements were implemented. Where these approaches worked, they were incorporated into the Demo operations. Where they did not work, the Demo management tried to recognize the failure early, analyze the reasons for sub-optimal results, reevaluate the requirement and find a better way. Because the Demo was a research facility engaged in production, it was necessary to have a flexibility to engage in this type of operational review and improvement on an ongoing basis.

Payment problems by the government persisted both at the contract level as well as the garment production level. The Cal Poly Foundation dealt with the bulk of these problems but oftentimes had to involve Demo staff. Additionally, the Demo had ongoing difficulty in bringing Year 1-3 budget revision approvals to closure in a timely manner. The same paperwork was provided five times to the Contracting Officer and while DLA-PM had approved the paperwork, the finished contract modification has not been completed to date. Problems such as these proved to be a regular diversion of Demo staff time.

8.0 Summary and Future Plans

During the two years of contract operation the ATRC gained experience and collected information in all of the contractually required areas of the DLA Demonstration. This is documented here and in the other final technical reports produced by the Demo.

The Demo completed successfully all tasks assigned to it in all the required areas of:

1. Manufacturing of military items including hard to procure items
2. Military contractor recruitment including an incubator project
3. Interaction with industry – Coalition, education and assistance
4. Virtual Prime Vendor initiative

At the end of Year 5 DLA program management decided not to exercise the Year 6 and 7 option. With notification coming only 10 days before the end of the contract year, the University did not have sufficient time to plan for the loss of funding and had no choice but to close the activity on the last day of the Year 5 contract. This resulted in a total of 43 positions being terminated by November 30, 2000.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Glossary

AAVS	Apparel Asset Visibility System
AMM	Apparel Merchandising & Management degree program
ARN	Apparel Research Network
ASAPWeb	Web tool for government contractors to report WIP and FG
ATRC	Apparel Technology & Research Center
BDU	Battle Dress Uniform
BIFRS-W	Balanced Inventory Flow Replenishment System
CAGE Code	Commercial & Government Entity Code
CAR	Clemson Apparel Research
Cfm	Contractor furnished material
CLINS	Line item deliverables on government production contracts
Coalition	ATRC Advisory Board
CP	Cal Poly
DAMES	Government Bill and Hold system
DD250	Government form for shipping and payment
Demo	Demonstration manufacturing activity
DFAS	Government payment office
DLA	Defense Logistics Agency
DLIS	Defense Logistics Information Service
DoD	Department of Defense
DSCP	Defense Supply Center Philadelphia
E-commerce	Electronic commerce
ETP	Employment Training Panel
FG	Finished goods
FTP	File transfer protocol
Gfm	Government furnished material
JPC	Joint Planning Committee of ARN
MCRD-SD	Marine Corp Recruit Depot-San Diego
MOCAS	Mechanization of Contract Administration System
NSN	National Stock Number
PDIT	Product Data Integration Technologies, Inc.
PGC	Product Group Code
PM	Program Management
QAR	Quality Assurance Report
QLM	Quality Logistics Management
TCN	Tacking Control Number
"The Source"	ATRC Industry Sourcing Database
VIM	Virtual Item Manager
VPV	Virtual Prime Vendor
WInS	Web Invoicing System at DFAS
WAWF	Wide Area Work Flow
WIP	Work in Progress
WtW	Welfare to Work training program

Appendix B

List of Products Made at the ATRC Demo

Commercial Customers Year 4 + Year 5

<u>Commercial Customers</u>	Product	Income
Butt Out Denim Swimwear	Cut and sew swimwear	\$1,683.34
Chica Mala	Embroider shirts	370.22
Customline	Embroider shirts, jackets, caps	6,233.80
Dahle's	Cut and sew polo shirts	4,278.00
Disneyland Costuming	Sew patches	491.88
EBO	Patternwork	2,814.52
EK	Cut and sew shower caps	1,577.50
Grand Prix Apparel	Jackets, shirts	33,013.73
Lady-T Golfware	Patternwork	1,131.15
Manfred Sauer, Inc	Cut and sew protectors and pants	5,723.07
Mr. Remo	Sew jackets and dresses	17,223.80
P.D.I.T. Inc	Golf shirts	3,463.18
Pasadena Unified School District	Embroider polo shirts	3,859.33
Quiksilver, Inc	Sew Hawaiian shirts	483,989.58
Susan Dunn, Inc	Cut and sew various sportswear garments	3,871.45
UC Davis	Cut and sew firefighter suits	1,021.02
Western Univ. Bookstore	Cut and sew labcoats	15,140.60
	Total	\$585,886.17

<u>University Customers</u>	Product	Income
Ag Field Day	Screenprint T-shirts	\$3,897.00
Alumni Affairs	Screenprint T-shirts	568.31
Associated Students	Screenprint and embroider T-shirts and polo shirts	3,934.87
Bronco Bookstore	Lab coats	2,712.50
Cal Poly Foundation	Screenprint T-shirts	7,288.24
College of Ag	Embroider caps	2,640.13
College of Bus. Adm.	Embroider shirts	279.29
Credit Union	Screenprint T-shirts	334.49
Encinitas Hall	Screenprint T-shirts	623.52
Facilities Mgmt.	Embroidered caps, T- shirts	4,674.38
Instructional Technology	Embroider polo shirts	4,505.38
Los Olivos Dormitory	Screenprint T-shirts	209.46
Orientation Services	Screenprint T-shirts	2,574.17
Mail Services	Screenprint T-shirts and polo shirts	799.41
SEES Dept.	Screenprint polo shirts	1,299.00
Student Health Services	Cut, sew, screenprint emergency vests and embroider polo shirts	2,454.31
	Total	\$38,794.46
	Combined Total	\$627,134.94

Appendix C
Equipment List

Equipment	Manufacturer	Model	Serial #
Cover Stitch	Brother	FD4-B272	M8527014
Cover Stitch	Brother	FD4-B272	L1578643
Under Trim Double Needle	Brother	LT2B885-905	L5521707
Under Trim Bartack	Brother	LK3-B450E-2	A6538988
Sew Over Lock	Brother	MA4V61-95-5	D6558600
Sew Over Lock	Brother	MA4V61-95-5	D6558604
Sew Over Lock	Brother	MA4V61-95-5	D6558599
Sew Over Lock	Brother	MA4V61-95-5	D6559251
Under Trim Single Needle	Durkopp	271-1400-42	334202
Over Lock	Juki Union	39500W	
Button Hole	Juki Union	LBH-795N	LBHWL40785
Button Hole	Juki Union	LBH-783	LBHXL51262
Bartack	Juki Union	LK-1852	LKOJE61583
Button Sew/Auto Feed	Juki Union	MB-373N	MBOYC330492
Cover Stitch	Juki Union	34800F16	1749004
Cover Stitch	Juki Union	CS122401 3B6OUT4	1783734
Button Hole	Juki Union	LBH-773	277101170
Bum & Stitch	Juki Union	37600-26	1722355
Under Trim Single Needle	Juki Union	DDL-550N7	DDLWG44430
Regular Single Needle	Juki Union	DDL-5550N	DDLYE41109
Single Needle	Juki Union	DLN-5410N-7	DLNN519140
Single Needle	Juki Union	DDL-5550N-3	DDLYC16858
Single Needle	Juki Union	DDL-5550N-7	DDLWG44258

Equipment	Manufacturer	Model	Serial #
Single Needle	Juki Union	DDL-5550N75	DDLNW25613
Single Needle	Juki Union	DDL-5550N-3	DDLYC16880
Single Needle	Juki Union	DDL-5550N-7	DDLXA43655
Single Needle	Juki Union	DDL-5550N-7	DDLWJ20821
Under Trim Single Needle	Juki Union	DDL-5550N-7	DDLWG442296
Regular Single Needle	Juki Union	DLN-5410N	DLNYC28120
Regular Double Needle	Juki Union	LH-3128	LHOXD03949
Regular Double Needle	Juki Union	LH-3168	LHOXA08317
Regular Double Needle	Juki Union	LH-3178	LHOXJ08241
Cutter	Lectra	Victor 2500	600656
12 Head Embroidery	Melco	EMC 10/12	1001

Over Lock	Pegasus	EX520402	9121435
Sew Over Lock	Pegasus	EX324403	9121861
Under Trim Single Needle	Pfaff	563	1485880
Sew Over-Lock	Singer	842U	J5595583
ZigZag	Singer	143W3	W1434641
Under Trim Single Needle	Singer	59/D300G	852810752
Sew Over-Lock	Singer	381	A2514201
Steam Boiler	Veit		80003914
Pocket Setter	Durkopp Adler		
Lectra Cutter	Lectra Systems		
Lectra CAD System	Lectra Systems		

Appendix D

Manufacturing Activity Logs

December 1, 1999 – November 30, 2000
Activity/Issue/Problem Log
For Coast Guard Shirts

			Resolution & Date
12/1	Will ATRC produce CG items?	<p>11/17 Dennis D. indicates CG trousers might be good items for ATRC to help DSCP with.</p> <p>12/15 Discussed at review whether ATRC could produce one or both items. Need to get all pertinent info together - patterns, specs, samples, prices, quantities, POC.</p> <p>1/7 Answer due to DSCP on short sleeve shirt.</p> <p>1/15 Answer due to DSCP on l/s shirt & Coalition member.</p> <p>1/27 Revised to mid-Feb.</p> <p>2/22 P/F visit Coalition member to discuss L/S shirt.</p> <p>4/3 DSCP and P visited the Coalition factory.</p> <p>6/20 Per Gail via phone w/Pam, Coalition member and ATRC have been evaluated as fine for the production of CG shirt.</p>	<p><i>1/13 J e-m Jim will do CG s/s shirt & place l/s shirt at Coalition member.</i></p> <p><i>2/24 Coalition member determined for l/s shirt - J notified Jim DP. and Gail while at ATRC.</i></p> <p><i>8/15 Julie and Sally at the meeting in Philadelphia determined there would be no award.</i></p>
12/6	Review patterns, specs and samples	<p>12/6 Receive 1st set of patterns, specs - no samples.</p> <p>12/7 Review and study patterns for upcoming 12/14 mtg.</p> <p>12/7 J e-m Michal about missing samples.</p>	

	<p>12/8 J e-m Gail about missing samples.</p> <p>12/9 Jim DP. said would bring samples on Dec. 14.</p> <p>12/7 Found major defects in men's pant.</p> <p>12/14 Rc'd notification first set of patterns and specs from DSCP were the wrong ones.</p> <p>12/14 Call Sally & Dennis for clarification on items - women's shirts are only items to consider.</p> <p>12/15 H start review and study of 2nd set of patterns, specs and samples.</p> <p>1/6 P/H finish pattern evaluation of 2nd set. Issues found were minimal.</p> <p>1/19 Rc'd e-m from Ann Beecroft that the spec and pattern have been changed and will not be available until mid Feb.</p> <p>1/20 Rc'd e-m from Jim that change in spec does not affect moving forward and that the 3rd pattern will be forwarded immediately.</p> <p>2/11 H completed evaluation of 3rd pattern.</p> <p>2/14 H e-m Jim DP. re: missing pocket and button placements from pattern - also needed graded nest.</p> <p>2/22 P e-m Gail asking about 2/14.</p> <p>2/22 P e-m Jim, Gail and Frank requesting info on cuff pattern. Is cuff round or square?</p> <p>2/24 Jim and Gail, during their visit to the ATRC indicated the CG was reviewing the pattern and the new spec and that the DSCP was waiting to hear. Jim and Gail said, as soon as they receive the approval they would forward the 4th set of patterns, templates and specs for pocket/button placements & graded</p>	<p>12/14 Rc'd 2nd set of patterns.</p> <p>1/25 Rc'd 3rd set of patterns from Gail.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>nest.</p> <p>2/24 The ATRC indicated to Gail, the pattern received on 1/25 shows a square cuff and a rounded cuff - asked Gail which cuff to make.</p> <p>3/3 P called Gail left message re: binding at cuff area. Pattern rec'd does not have marking for slit cut as per written specifications and diagram. Pattern has pleat notches only.</p> <p>3/6 P e-m Gail, Jim and Frank about sleeve?</p> <p>3/8 E-m from Gail indicating the new pattern went out that day</p> <p>3/8 Pam called Gail regarding Fed Ex tracking # of new CG long sleeve shirt. Gail returned call and stated the mail room at the DSCP neglected to send it out 3/7 as promised, hindering ATRC's meeting with Coalition partner and the production of sample for send out 3/9/00 to the DSCP.</p> <p>3/10 Pam informed Gail the pattern received for the s/s shirt was marked a size 14 and actually measured a size 14 ½ finished. The sample submitted would be marked size 14 ½. Gail said she would check s/s pattern.</p> <p>4/4 Gail stated she is waiting to receive pattern # 5 from the Coast Guard. Gail said she would forward them to ATRC ASAP.</p> <p>4/11 F e-m G requesting info on pattern ETA.</p> <p>4/20 F phone call to G requesting Pattern #5.</p> <p>4/24 F left message with G requesting Pattern #5.</p> <p>5/16 Per e-m from Gail, her proposed availability of pattern # 5 is for 5/31.</p> <p>6/23 Pam e-m Gail regarding the</p>	<p>2/24 Gail checked her paper work and said use the rounded cuff per new C.G. specs.</p> <p>3/6 E-m from Gail saying the pattern was incorrect and specifications are correct. Gail said she would Fed Ex a revised pattern 3/7.</p> <p>3/9 The ATRC received corrected long sleeve pattern for CG shirt from Gail.</p> <p>6/15 Received Pattern # 5</p>
--	---	---

		<p>ATRC review of pattern # 5. Several things wrong with pattern. 6/28 Pam spoke to Gail re: Pattern #5. Gail stated she is waiting for CG's approval allowing DSCP to revise Pattern #5. 7/10 Gail e-m Pam that DSCP is taking care of the pattern and that she would send 4 copies upon completion. 7/14 ATRC must review pattern #6 make up sample and review draft specifications.</p>	<p><i>From the CG via email. Sent paper copies to Gail per her request.</i></p> <p><i>7/13 Received pattern #6 with unapproved spec draft. 8/15 Approved for production.</i></p>
12/10	Need quantities	<p>12/10 E-m from Ann B. on past quantities for CG items. 1/18 J called Annemarie about quantities to develop price. Annemarie said would give answer by 1/21. 1/25 Bill called Annemarie. 1/27 Bill called Annemarie. 1/28 J e-m Annemarie.</p>	<p><i>1/31 Annemarie provided preliminary qtys. 2/4 Gail provided final rqmts.</i></p>
12/14	Need previous prices	<p>12/14 Bernie called Sally to get previous prices.</p>	<p><i>12/15 Sally provided \$ amounts.</i></p>
1/13	Need POC info	<p>1/13 J e-m Jim</p>	<p><i>1/14 Jim provides POC-Annemarie Mooney.</i></p>
1/14	Order collar stays - for sample	<p>1/14 F checked 2 vendors for collar stays/CG shirts - min. order on this item: 200 gross @ \$1.50/gr. 2/17 F called & e-m Gail V. requesting samples of collar stays for shirt.</p>	<p><i>2/21 Rc'd stays from vendor. 2/24 Gail inspected & approved vendor stays at</i></p>

			<i>the ATRC.</i>
1/14	Order collar support (pkgng) - for sample	<p>1/14 F call 2 vendors. 2/16 F call add'l vendor. 2/21 Rc'd collar support samples. 2/24 Gail V. inspected support samples at the ATRC and did not approve. Gail said she would locate vendor for Fran. 2/25 F is continuing to source the item. 3/2 F e-m Annemarie for info. 3/8 F call Joe DeBlase for info. 3/10 Joe called back with info - also indicated pkg rqmts. were more than what's listed in the FRI. 3/10 E-m from Jim DP. indicating it is inappropriate to talk with the Coast Guard.</p>	<p><i>3/9 F found supplier - Doran. 3/13 J replied OK.</i></p>
1/14	Order buttons - for sample	<p>1/14 F order mil spec button. 2/14 Rc'd buttons for samples.</p>	<i>2/24 Gail inspected and approved the buttons for samples.</i>
1/27	Need CFM sources	<p>1/27 DSCP indicated CG shirt was CFM-ATRC needs fabric to make required samples. 1/28 J e-m Annemarie for CFM sources. 2/24 Dan River replied with an estimated 9-week lead. ATRC still looking for other sources due to long lead-time. 2/24 F contacted Mainzer-Minton for fabric source - can't provide. 2/25 F contacted Springs Mills regarding CG fabric - can't provide. 3/2 F e-m Anne Marie on prices for CFM - does DSCP know someone cheaper?</p>	<p><i>1/31 Annemarie provided fabric manuf - Dan River.</i></p> <p><i>2/25 Will use Dan River for pricing. ***Waiting for answer.</i></p>
1/31	Order CFM - for sample	<p>1/31 F sent e-m to Dan River Inc. for more info on fabric. 2/1 F sent another e-m to Dan River - called direct to Corp. Office for sales rep. 2/1 F called Ed Supinski - N.Y. He</p>	

		<p>will refer us to L.A. based rep. - waiting to hear back.</p> <p>2/1 Ed has given us the info on CG shirt cloth - #AF1550 Blue.</p> <p>2/10 F ordered sample fabric.</p> <p>2/24 Dan River's Chris Young (local rep) responded with a 2 week lead time if the fabric is in stock. If the fabric is not in stock it's a 9- week lead time.</p> <p>4/4 At Sewing Co. review and 4/6 e-mail - Pam requested from Gail at least 10 yds. of fabric for re-submittal of samples using new pattern.</p> <p>7/13 Waiting for balance of CFM for samples.</p>	<p>2/7 - Rc'd 5 yds. of fabric from Gail for making samples.</p> <p>2/24 Rec'd 10 yds. sample yardage from Dan River.</p> <p>6/20 Per Gail via phone w/Pam, we are to order sample fabric from Dan River.</p> <p>7/18 Received CFM.</p>
2/4	Sample required by DSCP	<p>2/4 E-m from Gail - Need to make sample - due 3/1.</p> <p>2/14 Finished factory sewing instructions with sequence of operations in module.</p> <p>2/24 During visit to the ATRC, P told Gail V. ATRC is having difficulty locating correct trim, will submit sample using substitute trims and a letter of explanation. Gail approved.</p> <p>2/29 E-m from Julie about revision of sample due date - now due 3/10.</p> <p>3/8 J e-m J, G, F, etc - the l/s shirt sleeve pattern has problems and the sample will need a few more days, should the s/s sample be sent now?</p> <p>3/15 E-m from Gail asking about when the l/s shirt sample would be ready.</p> <p>3/15 J e-m Gail - hopefully done the next day - will let her know for sure.</p> <p>3/16 E-m from Gail asking about</p>	<p>3/8 E-m from Gail - go ahead and send the s/s shirt sample.</p> <p>3/10 Short sleeve sample sent out with "substitution" letter and Manuf. Plan and letters of certification.</p>

		<p>1/s shirt progress.</p> <p>3/16 Long sleeve sample received from subcontractor in late afternoon.</p> <p>3/16 J e-m Gail the 1/s shirt is done and will be sent out on 3/17.</p> <p>3/18 E-m from Gail - can't find box - need tracking #.</p> <p>3/18 J e-m Gail with tracking # - Gail found the box.</p> <p>3/22 P talked to Gail about the s/s shirt sample - looked good - only a few minor problems. L/s shirt sample had several problems.</p> <p>3/31 P set up visit to the subcontractor for Gail and Frank for 4/3.</p> <p>4/5 Gail requested 2 more samples upon receipt of new pattern # 5.</p> <p>6/20 Gail via phone w/ Pam has asked for additional samples using pattern # 5 rec'd 6/15.</p> <p>7/13 Received pattern #6 ATRC will review and make up samples by the revised due date 8/3.</p> <p>8/15 Gail reviewed sample with Jean and Pam during visit to DSCP.</p>	<p><i>3/17 Long sleeve sample made by the subcontractor sent to DSCP.</i></p> <p><i>8/3 Samples from pattern #6 submitted.</i></p> <p><i>8/15 Samples accepted by Gail.</i></p>
2/4	Manufacturing plan required by DSCP	<p>2/4 E-m from Gail - need to submit Manufacturing Plan - due 2/16.</p> <p>2/22 J e-m Gail on outcome of review of plan.</p> <p>2/24 Visit from Jim indicated the Mfg. Plan submitted was incomplete. Jim then gave P a Mfg. Plan Guide - ATRC needs to do add'l work on plan.</p> <p>2/25 F start work to get letters of certification from the vendors.</p> <p>2/29 E-m from Julie about revision of Mfg. Plan due date - now 3/10.</p> <p>3/8 J e-m J, G, F, etc. on whether to go ahead and send Mfg. Plans even though 1/s shirt not done yet.</p> <p>3/10 Manufacturing Plan sent to</p>	<p><i>2/16 ATRC sent Mfg. Plan to DSCP.</i></p> <p><i>3/8 Gail replied go ahead and send the plans</i></p>

		<p>DSCP with letters of certification for ATRC and the subcontractor.</p> <p>4/4 Per review on 4/4 re-work Manufacturing Plan and submit by 4/14.</p> <p>4/14 P resubmitted the Manufacturing Plan and e-mailed it to Gail.</p> <p>4/20 Gail via phone call requested a revised Manufacturing Plan with updated SAMs.</p> <p>4/21 P faxed Gail updated revised Manufacturing Plan to G.</p>	<p><i>in now.</i></p> <p><i>6/20 Gail told Pam via phone, the Manufacturing Plans for ATRC and the Coalition member were fine.</i></p>
2/9	Order labels & barcodes - for sample	<p>2/9 F called 2 vendors for labels & barcodes. Waiting for reply on, price quotes, minimum quantities and lead-time.</p> <p>2/17 ATRC rc'd own label machine.</p> <p>2/29 F e-m Gail requesting info on actual size of size label as it is not specified in the docs the ATRC has.</p> <p>3/2 F talked to Scott Label - the 2x2 size is custom and very expensive.</p> <p>3/9 J e-m J, G, F - ? about size of care/content and size label.</p> <p>4/5 Gail stated in Oceanside and on 4/5 the care and content label should be a little larger than shown on sample submitted and that the font can be a combination of 6 & 8 fonts as long as it's legible.</p> <p>5/30 Fran located source for label. Cannot make or send sample label due to \$1,100.00 expense prior to award.</p> <p>7/18 Pam e-m Gail for specific directions regarding the Coast Guard label colors.</p>	<p><i>3/10 E-m from Gail - size of label not a problem - info on label must be clear.</i></p> <p><i>7/20 Gail directed ATRC to the area in document</i></p>

			<i>where colors are located.</i>
2/16	Order interlining - for sample	<p>2/16 F sent specs to vendor.</p> <p>2/17 F sent specs to add'l vendor.</p> <p>2/22 F e-m Gail on source for interlining.</p> <p>2/24 Visit from Gail and Jim, regarding sample. Gail said we could use the poly interlining we were using in the Marine s/s shirt. Just submit sample with explanation - F mailed Gail a different sample.</p> <p>2/25 F called Joe DeBlase for interlining source - left message.</p> <p>2/29 Joe called with vendor name and item # - vendor is Facemate.</p> <p>3/2 F talked to Aptan - they need mil spec # for the item.</p> <p>3/2 F e-m Anne Marie for spec info.</p> <p>3/3 Gail called Fran - use FRI info for description - sample sent too heavy.</p> <p>4/4 Show another sample to Gail at review meeting on 4/4.</p>	<p><i>2/21 First vendor answered did not have item.</i></p> <p><i>2/21 2nd vendor answered - needs more info.</i></p> <p><i>4/4 G approved interlining sample.</i></p>
2/29	Need NSN/Size chart	2/29 F e-m Gail for the NSN/size chart for the CG shirt.	<i>***Waiting to hear from Gail after the award.</i>
3/2	Need full spec for shirts	<p>3/2 F e-m Anne Marie asking for a full spec on the 2 shirts.</p> <p>4/4 Received Purchase Specs. Full specs will be provided after the award.</p>	<i>***Fran will follow up with Anne Marie when samples are approved.</i>
3/13	Can the CG shirt become the Demo cycle shirt?	<p>3/10 J talked with Julie about this.</p> <p>3/13 Julie sent e-m about looking at the possibilities.</p>	<i>***J will review this when the CG award is finalized.</i>

4/4	Finding a die cutting house for flaps	4/4 Subcontractor review: Frank suggested Sue find a die cutting house to cut the flaps in order to assist maintaining uniformity in the shape of the flap.	4/5 Sue & F located 2 die cutting houses.
4/4	List of all materials and packaging requirements needed for shirt	4/4 Discussion with Gail at the review. 4/5 Gail said she would send a complete list of all materials needed to finalize the sourcing. 4/7 J, F phoned G requesting more detail on bags, labels and pkg. material. 4/11 F e-m G for more detail on the pkg. material.	4/7 Received listing of materials. 6/20 Gail via phone to Pam stated we are to use our own resources to determine the necessary packaging materials. We can use similar packaging material used commercially for a dress shirt, as long as the shirt is presentable in its package.
4/11	Need to use DSCP Exclusive label	4/11 F e-m Gail about source for DSCP Exclusive label. 4/20 F phoned G about possible source for label. G still looking.	5/11 Gail e-m Fran possible sources for the woven label.
4/11	Source for Poly Bags	4/11 F e-m G requesting a possible source for poly bags.	4/17 G informed F of source for bags.
4/4	First Article Inspection	4/4 Frank & Gail requested that ATRC do a test cut of 50 pcs. prior to production. They will come to ATRC to inspect.	***ATRC agreed upon receipt of award.

6/20	SPO or ARN award for Coast Guard shirt produc- tion	6/20 Gail via phone w/Pam requesting info on whether the CG shirt is SPO or ARN. 6/21 Jean replied to Gail via email. Jean was not sure and Gail would have to check with Julie. 6/21 Waiting for a response from Gail.	<i>8/15 Julie and Sally at the meeting in Philadelphia determined there would be no award.</i>
------	--	--	--

December 1, 1999 – November 30, 2000
Activity/Issue/Problem Log
For Maternity BDU

		Resolution & Date	
12/1	DSCP called Dunbar's directly	12/1 J e-m Herb - Dunbar's upset because rc'd direct call from Karen Slevin asking for change of sizes.	12/1 Herb took care of issue.
12/13	Request for yields by size	12/13 Herb called J and asked for yield info.	12/13 J/F faxed Herb requested info.
12/21	Disposal of garment 2nds	12/21 J e-m Bernie for correct procedures for disposal. 12/22 J advised Dunbar's on DSCP's approval of sale of damaged BDU's.	12/22 Bernie gave permission with conditions.
12/22	Implement QC Program	12/22 First QC audit scheduled for 1/5.	1/5 P completed audit.
1/5	DSCP requires samples	1/5 8 samples are to be shipped by due date of 2/4. 2/4 Shipped on schedule. 2/14 Evaluation reply due from DSCP. 2/24 Jim/Gail at ATRC - no evaluation. 3/9 J e-m Jim, Gail, Frank requesting evaluation in writing about the samples submitted. 4/4 Gail requested samples from each month's production. 4/27 April samples sent to Gail - 2 coats & 2 slacks. 5/25 May samples sent to Gail for evaluation - 2 coats & 2 slacks. 6/15 Sent June samples - 2 coats and 2 slacks to Gail. 7/21 Sent July samples - 1 jacket size 8 S and 1 pant size 18 R to	3/10 Bernie e-m that the samples were OK. 6/2 Gail forwarded Larry G's evaluations with minor

		DSCP. 8/31 Contract finished.	<i>corrections to buttonhole. 6/2 Gail forwarded good evaluation from Larry for April and May samples. 8/24 Received samples back from Gail. ***Waiting for June, July, Aug. samples evaluation.</i>
1/13	Accelerating delivery schedule - for Jan. & Feb.	1/13 F talked to Herb about a revised schedule.	<i>1/19 Herb indicated OK for Jan/Feb.</i>
1/13	Need mod. for error in D.O. - NSN, size	1/13 F asked Herb for mod. 1/19 Herb indicated it is being worked on. ATRC holding completed product until receive mod. 1/21 F called Herb - left message. 1/27 F called Herb and Karin S. on mod - left message. 2/2 F e-m Herb asking about progress on mod. 2/17 F e-m Herb asking about mod. 2/21 F e-m Herb mod is OK. 3/6 F e-m Herb - where is mod?	<i>2/17 Herb called Fran and said the review copy was coming. 2/18- F rc'd review copy of mod from Herb. 3/7 Brian sent mod #402, #403.</i>
1/18	Data on cost of damaged fabric	1/18 P asked Dunbar's for detailed data on damages and lost time. 1/19 J e-m Herb, Bernie on excess costs due to damaged fabric.	<i>1/21 P received partial report</i>

		<p>2/3 Herb requested documentation.</p> <p>2/11 Herb requested info from Dunbar's.</p> <p>2/11 J e-m Herb - have asked Dunbar's for info by 2/22.</p> <p>2/11 P again requested data from Dunbar's on damages to give to Herb.</p> <p>2/18 Herb asked again for info from Dunbar's.</p> <p>2/21 P requested data again from Dunbar's.</p> <p>2/24 Herb called F - indicated ATRC/Dunbar's would be compensated for dealing with fabric damages.</p> <p>2/24 P again requested data from Dunbar's.</p> <p>2/29 Received partial info from Dunbar's - the quantity of damaged rolls and yardage at the Dunbar's.</p> <p>3/2 P at Dunbar's - rqstd info.</p> <p>3/8 P at Dunbar's - rqstd info.</p> <p>3/15 P at Dunbar's - rqstd info.</p> <p>3/22 P at Dunbar's - rqstd info.</p> <p>4/20 P requested info from Dunbar.</p>	<p><i>from Dunbar's on damaged fabric.</i></p> <p><i>2/3 J e-m Herb the Dunbar's are collecting data.</i></p>
		<p>3/2 E-m from Gail on there will be no compensation for excess damages.</p> <p>3/2 J e-m Gail about clarification on no compensation.</p>	<p><i>4/20 They will not supply info until end of contract. Due to accelerated production, manpower not available to inspect.</i></p> <p><i>5/22 Rec'd partial info on damaged fabric from Dunbar - 3,297.75 yards.</i></p> <p><i>3/2 Gail answered that there will be no compensation.</i></p>
1/21	Request	1/21 - F sent request to Mamie	

	gfm- Mar. and Apr. prod. (15,000 yds.)	<p>Brown - requested ETA of fabric - normal delivery NLT 1/31.</p> <p>1/24 F called Herb re: gfm status.</p> <p>1/25 F called Herb/Karen re: BDU gfm. Told Karen prod. line stopped - no fabric to cut.</p> <p>1/26 F called Herb again.</p> <p>1/27 F called Herb again.</p> <p>1/28 F called Herb again.</p> <p>2/1 F called Herb - told him we ordered gfm on 1/21 - he did not know this.</p> <p>2/2 F e-m Herb asking about location for fabric.</p> <p>2/2 F called Herb - referred to Karen.</p> <p>2/2 F called Karen - no answer - finally called Jim Kane.</p> <p>2/2 Jim had Herb call. Herb said the cloth went out 2/2 - Karen has not confirmed shipment went out.</p> <p>2/3 Herb answered the fabric was shipped.</p> <p>2/4 F left msg. w/Herb re:? on where BDU gfm is - no reply.</p> <p>2/7 Herb checked and said they were closed for 3 snow days- which is why the delay in shipment. Herb said he would track the shipment to see where it is. Will advise by 2/8.</p> <p>2/8 Karen Slevin called -fabric is in Pomona at Roadway Express!</p>	<p>2/7 Herb called-said the cloth was shipped on 2/1.</p> <p>2/8 Shipment rc'd - Dunbar p/u 2/8- 1pm.</p>
2/2	Damaged garments - inspection	2/2 Dunbar called P - needed help in determining damaged garments from shippable garments.	2/2 P did 100% inspection on finished garments and found 84% defective due to fabric flaws.
2/2	Produc-	2/2 F e-m Herb about fabric being	

<p>tion stopped - severe fabric flaws (Jan/Feb produc- tion)</p>	<p>so damaged that Dunbar's stopped production. 2/2 Herb requested sample yardage on damaged rolls 3 to 5yds from various rolls to be sent to DSCP on 2/4. 2/8 Mar/Apr fabric delivered - Dunbar's pickup. 2/9 Pam did audit on shipment of BDU fabric. Checked 8 rolls - 4 unusable = 14% defect level 2/10 Prod. resumed using Mar/Apr fabric. 2/11 Dunbar stopped production due to severe fabric flaws. Pam inspected fabric flaws at Dunbar's - remains the same. Checked 12 rolls 4 unusable = Audit shows 33% defective. 2/11 J called Herb, Jim K., Bernie - Bernie replied would send an inspector (Larry G.) to depot to inspect fabric - J did f/u e-m. 2/14 Jim K. called confirming Bernie's msg. 2/16 J called Herb - waiting for box sent on 2/4 before decide what to do - inspector not going to depot. 2/17 ATRC sent another box of damaged goods to Herb. 2/18 J called Bernie - now depot inspecting 10,000 yds. Not sure whether will be able to find enough good fabric or will have to go buy fabric. Depot inspection will take until 2/23 approx. 2/18 J called Herb - waiting for box to show up so can decide if variance might be OK. 2/22 Herb called Dunbar's and asked what % inspected and if fabric made by 2 vendors. 2/22 J called Herb - DSCP rc'd 2nd box and reviewed damages. Larry is coming to LA next M/T. Herb will go</p>	<p><i>2/4 Shipped 45 yards of fabric from assorted damaged rolls to DSCP by overnight - waiting for review outcome - Phila. did not receive box until 3/3.</i></p> <p><i>2/11 E-m from Herb confirming the 2/11 info.</i></p>
---	---	---

		<p>ahead and ship 10,000 yds. from the depot that has been looked at. Should arrive this week.</p> <p>2/24 Jim DP., Gail and Pam inspected 4 rolls of fabric rec'd 2/21 (the Jan/Feb. replacement yds.) Jim, Gail and P agree this fabric is slightly flawed but not as severe as the Jan/Feb shipment or the Mar/Apr. shipment. Jim also stated he would try and get the ATRC a variance from the DSCP to use fabric with some flaws and an increase in price for time lost in handling flawed fabric. The ATRC did ask Jim if he would like to inspect rolls from 2/8-Mar/Apr shipment of damaged rolls. Jim stated because the shipment is so damaged, he preferred to only examine the 2/21 Jan/Feb replacement shipment of gfm. Jim did not go to Dunbar's to inspect the original Jan/Feb shipment.</p> <p>2/24 Herb called F - asked if Bernie was here and looking at fabric - when he found out Bernie was not here but Jim was he asked to speak to Jim. Herb also requested the Dunbar's examine more of the Mar/Apr. fabric.</p> <p>2/29 J e-m Herb about request for return of marked fabric samples & compensation for excess damages.</p>	<p><i>2/28 J called Herb to inquire about Larry coming the next day - Herb said Larry was not coming - indicated Jim's visit on 2/24 was the official visit to review the fabric - J indicated this was not conveyed by</i></p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>3/2 E-m from Gail on how to request Sears scale and there will be no compensation for excess damages.</p>	<p><i>Jim to the ATRC - Herb indicated it was up to the ATRC to make the call about going ahead with production - there will be no variance from DSCP. 3/1 ATRC will use Sears scale for evaluating fabric flaws and DSCP will do a depot inspection before sending replacement yardage.</i></p>
2/2	<p>Replacement of damaged fabric - for Jan/Feb. prod.</p>	<p>2/2 F e-m Herb need replacement fabric. 2/3 Herb answered and had questions. 2/3 F e-m Herb to find out how to get the fabric quickly. 2/3 F ordered fabric - request to replace damaged BDU cloth (3,789 yds). 2/7 F asked Herb for fast ship. Order was to go direct to Karen Slevin - per Herb. 2/8 Karen is doing 03 priority ship on this cloth.</p>	<p><i>2/21 Received 5,000 yds. 2/22 Dunbar picked up partial. 2/24 Balance of shipment sent.</i></p>
2/22	<p>10,000 replacement yards ordered</p>	<p>2/22 J called Herb - H will go ahead and ship 10,000 yds. depot has looked at - to arrive this week. 2/29 J called Herb about not rc'vng the 10,000 yds. yet - Herb indicated</p>	

	(for Jan/Feb/ Mar/ Apr)	he would find out where the fabric is.	3/2 Rc'd 10,000 yds.
2/23	Accelerate delivery for Apr. to Feb.	2/23 Pat e-m Herb – can we ship early on Apr. production to help offset losses of Feb. due to damaged fabric? 2/23 Herb replied with questions. 2/23 Pat replied w/ asking for shipping authorization.	2/29 Herb approved early shipment-shipment completed.
3/14	Order add'l replacement yardage	3/14 J e-m Herb about add'l replacement yards needed. 3/17 J returned call to Jim Kane - not ready for another 10,000 yds. yet - the damaged unusable fabric is still being sorted. 3/22 Herb called Esther and inquired about when to ship fabric. Esther called the ATRC to answer Herb. 3/22 F e-m Herb what the discussion was with Jim Kane. 4/16 Fran ordered 10,000 additional yards from Jim K. 6/19 Jim e-m Fran wanting to send additional 10,000 yds. Also Jim asked what amount of fabric will we need to complete contract? 6/19 Fran e-m Jim stating we are waiting for reply from sub-contractor regarding additional fabric needed. 6/26 Fran ordered additional 5,000 yards needed to complete contract.	4/20 ATRC received 10,000 yds. ATRC needs to arrange time for an additional shipment. 5/23 ATRC rec'd 10,000 yds. 7/12 Received delivery of 5000 yards and an additional 3,000 yards for the new SPO.

4/10	Request for additional shipment of pants	<p>4/10 Pat e-m Herb requesting a mod to ship 47 pants size 12L on Order #403.</p> <p>4/28 Pat e-m Jim Kane requesting the same mod but to include 25 coats size 6S.</p> <p>5/8 Jim e-m Pat - said Michele Godwin is now handling contract. The slacks can't be accepted but the coats can per Jim.</p> <p>5/11 Pat called Michele</p> <p>5/16 Norma e-m Jim K. regarding the possibility of issuing a mod to the current ATRC contract for the production of more units in order to use up left over fabric.</p> <p>5/22 Pat called M - M stated she is still waiting for signatures on a mod and Michele also requested an SPO for total pants and coats.</p> <p>5/22 Waiting for mod or SPO from M.</p> <p>5/30 Waiting to hear from Fran on fabric inventory to produce SPO of 553 slacks & 420 coats.</p> <p>6/21 Fran e-m M yardage info. 806 yds. for coat and 808 yds. for slack.</p> <p>7/11 Michele spoke to Fran and said the contract is SPO and between the 2 SPOs there is a total of 1000 units.</p> <p>7/13 Waiting for SPOs.</p> <p>7/24 Jim e-m Pam & called Fran. Jim said the SPO should be signed by 7/25.</p> <p>7/26 Waiting for SPO.</p>	<p><i>5/16 Jim e-m Norma he is checking into whether DSCP can place an additional order. DSCP may want to buy more.</i></p> <p><i>5/17 Michele replied pant couldn't be accepted because the CLIN is closed. M can give ATRC a mod of 2% on coats or an SPO on total pants and coats.</i></p> <p><i>8/15 Jim Kane gave the SPO to Jean and Pam in Philadelphia on 8/15.</i></p>
4/27	Unit Pack discrepancy	<p>4/27 Diane e-m J asking why we were using a unit pack of 25 instead of 35.</p> <p>5/30 P requested direction from Diane via update letter #6.</p>	<p><i>4/27 J e-m D stating Kathy had instructed ATRC over a year ago to use</i></p>

			25/40 pack. 5/31 Diane e-m the unit pack for ATRC will continue at 25/40 until end of contract.
8/18	NSN numbers do not match SPO	8/21 Fran e-mailed Jim asking for clarification on the NSN #s.	8/22 Jim e- mailed Fran clarifying all the NSN #s.
8/31	Pat Strain's concern over the ATRC doing the BDU SPO	8/31 Pam and Jean e-mailed Jim and Pat regarding the capabilities of the ATRC doing the BDU SPO. 9/5 J e-m Pat the ATRC is still working with the Dunbar's to see if they can do the SPO. 9/6 Dunbar's replied - no they cannot do the work. 9/6 ATRC ordered all trims - waiting to receive to make samples. 9/22 F e-m Pat that not all trims have arrived yet but that samples can be completed by Oct. 6. 9/25 E-m from Sarah Brunner about ATRC making BDU? J forwarded the 9/22 e-m w/ Pat that ATRC would do production. 10/9 F e-m Pat Strain re: samples sent for approval via UP-Red today. 10/17 F received fax from Pat S. with needed changes for prod. run.	8/31 Pat requested the ATRC make samples for approval before commencing production. 9/29 E-m from Pat that Oct. 6 date is OK. 10/17 ATRC sent back answer that ATRC will make all necessary changes when they start prod.
8/31	Extension for due date of BDU SPO	8/31 Pam e-mailed Jim regarding an extension for the new SPO until 10/31. 8/31 Jim e-mailed Pam said he had no problem with the 10/31.	10/30 ATRC received the

		extension.	<i>mod for the new SPO on BDU - new delivery date: 11/30/00 for both the pant and coat.</i>
10/18	Mod for extra pieces	<p>10/18 F-e-m Sarah B. re: status of mod for BDU inventory on hand- Jim K. accepted these and was to send ATRC a mod for the new SPO. 10/19 F sent Sarah B. inventory by size of coat and pant.</p> <p>11/14 F e-m Pat S. about accepting an additional 4 pieces.</p>	<p><i>10/30 ATRC received the mod for new SPO which includes the extra inventory of BDU items</i></p> <p><i>11/15 Pat agreed to accept extra pieces.</i></p>

December 1, 1999 – November 30, 2000
Activity/Issue/Problem Log
For Maternity Dress Uniform

			Resolution & Date
12/14	Extra D.O. beyond end of contract year	12/14 E-m from Tom H. asking if we can do D.O. 437 & 438 even though past 11/30 stop date. Indicated we would but needed different delivery date.	12/22 Tom sent revised D.O. dates.
12/14	Latest QC Mil-STD	12/14 Jim DP. promised the updated QC Mil-STD manual. 1/31 P e-m Jim, Gail, Frank. 2/14 P e-mail again.	2/16 Received.
12/14	Pattern/construction mods on tunic	12/14 Jim promised to send the latest pattern/construction mods for tunic. 1/31 P e-m again. 2/14 P e-m again.	2/24 Mods were hand delivered by Jim and Gail.
12/15	Correct darts on skirt	12/15 Need to correct unbalanced darts on skirt. 12/16 P worked with cutter to insure a punch hole when cutting.	12/16 New directions implemented.
12/15	Sewing defects in tunic	12/15 Need to create revised factory sewing instructions. 1/3 P worked with factory on revisions.	1/5 Implemented new sewing instructions.
12/15	Correct pressing specs	12/15 Need to change pressing specs. 1/3 P worked with factory on new procedures for all military items.	1/4 Implemented w/ tunic.
12/15	DSCP requires samples	12/15 Jim DP. requested 3 samples of ea. and promised to return in one week. First to be shipped on 2/4. 2/24 Jim and Gail hand delivered the report on their visit to the ATRC. 3/9 J e-m J, G, F requesting an evaluation in writing on samples.	2/4 Shipped samples—expecting report back on 2/14.

		<p>3/10 E-m from Gail of request for new skirt and slack samples with the new nylon interlock.</p> <p>4/4 Gail requested samples from each month's production.</p> <p>4/21 P sent 2 samples of the tunic and 2 of the women's s/s shirt to Gail.</p> <p>4/26 N e-m Gail requesting samples to be returned to ATRC.</p> <p>4/27 Gail e-m N stating samples will be returned.</p> <p>4/28 L/s sample shipped to Gail.</p> <p>5/11</p> <p>5/25 ATRC sent 2 s/s maternity shirts, 2 l/s mat. shirts, & 2 MDU slacks.</p> <p>5/31 N e-m G again requesting return of samples. Need samples to complete orders.</p> <p>6/1 Samples returned but no evaluation received for May samples.</p> <p>6/15 Sent 2 skirts but still waiting for evaluation.</p> <p>7/21 Sent 1 skirt sample to DSCP for July.</p> <p>8/16 Sent Gail 2 s/s MDU shirts, 2 l/s MDU shirts & 2 MDU slacks.</p>	<p>3/10 Gail e-m evaluation.</p> <p>4/28 Gail e-m P giving approval on samples sent on 4/21.</p> <p>5/11 Rec'd good eval from Gail for 4/28 samples. Gail has asked for minor corrections to construction of l/s and s/s shirts in neck area - button and loop placements.</p> <p>Also 3/8" finish sleeve binding width on l/s shirt.</p> <p>6/2 Samples returned by overnight Fed Ex.</p> <p>7/20 Gail e-m Pam an A rating for the June skirt samples.</p> <p>***Waiting for July & Aug. evaluation and sample return.</p>
12/15	Change ident./instruction	12/15 Need to change Identification/ Instruction labels in tunic as indicated in spec. sheet.	1/17 Revised text - complete.

	labels		
12/15	Correct waist on slack	12/15 Waist on slack does not meas. to spec - need to change. 12/16 P completed elastic test. Gave factory cut meas. for elastic to conform to specs.	12/16 New meas. implemented.
12/15	Correct side seam allowance - slack	12/15 Side seam allowance incorrect width. 12/16 P reviewed pattern and specs. Revised sewing instructions per spec and pattern.	12/16 Correction implemented.
12/15	Correct side seam allowance -skirt	12/15 Side seam allowance incorrect width. 12/16 P reviewed pattern and specs. Revised sewing instructions per spec and pattern.	12/16 Correction implemented.
12/15	Bar codes & DSCP Exclusive labels for tunic, slack and skirt	12/15 DSCP identified bar codes and DSCP Exclusive label were missing for tunic, slack and skirt. 2/4 J e-m J, G, F and requested info on the requirements of barcodes and labels on Mat. Dress Uniform - mod P00013 says no barcodes are to be used.	2/7 Gail V. answered on barcodes that P00013 is correct and Bob Panichelle confirmed no on using DSCP labels.
12/21	ATRC produce any more MDU items?	12/21 J e-m Sally about CP continuing production of maternity dress items.	12/23 Sally answered yes and on 12/28 provided POC info.
1/7	Tunic interlin-ing shrinkage	1/7 Front fusible interlining shrinking in front self-facing of tunic. Cannot tack the facing inside to self-pleat - facing will not reach pleated area. P tested garment and sewing techniques in various ways. Removed lg. fusible interlining piece, used only the small V interlining as per DLA sample.	1/7 Start new interlining usage. 2/24 Per Jim and Gail's visit, the full interlining will be used in the front facing implementing

			<i>the blind stitch to tack facing to front.</i>
1/19	New small purchase order	<p>1/19 F received requests for price quotes on 4 items from Pat Martin - blocked production dates/space for promised small purchase order.</p> <p>1/24 F called Pat Martin re: price quotes - no answer & left message.</p> <p>1/27 F called again - left message.</p> <p>1/31 F called again - left message.</p> <p>2/7 F called again - left message.</p> <p>2/8 F called again - Pat said she would review info and get back to us - indicated order would be smaller than originally planned.</p> <p>2/9 F called Pat on where we are with price quotes submitted.</p> <p>2/9 Bill called Bob Panichelle and Sally about orders - Bob said would call back on 2/9 with answer on why order not released yet.</p> <p>2/11 F called Tom Hutchinson re: SPO.</p> <p>2/15 Bill called Bob - left msg and f/u e-m.</p> <p>2/16 Bill called Bob - Bob needs to talk to Jim about samples - said he would call back on 2/16 about orders.</p> <p>2/18 F called Pat Martin to check on status of SPO.</p> <p>2/21 F called Pat Martin to check on status of SPO.</p> <p>3/1 F called Pat Martin for status of S.P.O. - Pat said she would call us on Friday 3/3 with an update.</p> <p>3/1 F talked to Tom H. - he confirmed the SPO is being finalized.</p> <p>3/6 F e-m Pat Martin - where is SPO?</p> <p>3/14 Bill called Bob to follow up. Bob conferred with Tom H. who indicated that the S.P.O. was to be</p>	<p><i>1/24 F sent price quotes to Pat Martin @ DSCP.</i></p> <p><i>2/1 F called again - Pat said she would get back to Fran by 2/7.</i></p> <p><i>2/17 Bob called Bill and said would go ahead with order.</i></p>

		submitted for funding and if no problem (none expected) would have P.O. by Friday (3/17). 3/15 F called Pat Martin for size breakdown on tunics in new order. 3/17 Size breakdown forecast for all styles came from Pat.	3/23 SPO came from Tom H.
1/31	Implement quality audits	1/31 Implement new quality audit procedures.	
2/3	Need change of delivery date - Order # 430	2/3 F e-m Brian - gfm did not arrive until 2/17 - need revised delivery date of 2/24. 2/3 E-m from Jim Serad - date change OK - will receive mod next week. 2/3 Brian e-m Jim to go ahead. 2/24 F e-m Brian - special order zippers arrived late - need date change to 3/3. 4/16 F e-m Brian requesting mod. 4/17 Brian e-m F will check & see if mod has been done already.	2/7 Received mod. 2/24 Brian replied OK. 4/26 Received mod.
2/9	Source nylon interlock for maternity panel	2/9 F called Lisa R. for info on nylon interlock for mat. skirt and slack - need sources/vendors from DSCP. DSCP said it had to be nylon interlock as the specs. Indicated need the vendor name, a sample of the item, in order to follow up. Lisa said she would check for sources with Jim DP. today. 2/11 F spoke w/Tom Hutchinson re: SPO for MDU - nylon interlock vendors. Tom said Bob P. would get back to us on 2/14 re: SPO. Tom said Jim DP. is following up on the nylon interlock vendors & sample pc. for us. 2/14 F placed calls to ATRC Coalition members for sources on interlock -Ramseur Interlock recommended. 2/23 F contacted Ramseur	2/10 Lisa called and said she asked everyone re: nylon interlock - no one has a vendor or source for this item.

		<p>Interlock.</p> <p>2/25 Rc'd sample from Ramseur.</p> <p>2/25 F sent sample to Gail to review.</p> <p>3/2 F spoke to Ramseur- requires 8 week lead time.</p> <p>3/2 F called Gail about sample sent - is it OK? Gail referred F to DAPS for spec info.</p> <p>3/2 F called Lisa R. to get DAPS # - downloaded the spec.</p> <p>3/8 E-m from Gail - several ? on sample sent - need certificate of compliance from supplier.</p> <p>3/9 J e-m J, G, F about problem with new interlock arriving in time for the start of the SPO - asked if we could use rib until interlock showed up.</p> <p>3/13 J e-m again about using rib until interlock shows up.</p> <p>3/15 Bill called Gail for input on interlock sent to her. Per Gail she does not need to review as long as it meets spec. Fran has indicated it does meet spec. Fran e-m Ramseur to place order now (due to 5-6 wk. lead time).</p> <p>3/17 F e-m Gail - vendor can supply Cert. of Compliance.</p> <p>3/29 F e-m Ramseur - need lab dip of color, rc'd greige goods sample, need to send color standard to Ramseur.</p> <p>4/21 Sent sample of skirt to Gail for approval of interlock color.</p> <p>4/28 G sent approval but there may be some confusion over sample sent to G. Maybe assumed it was a production sample.</p> <p>4/28 P e-m G to clarify that skirt was sent for interlock color approval.</p>	<p>3/13 Gail answered - cannot use rib.</p> <p>5/11 Gail approved interlock via e-m.</p>
2/16	Special measure-	2/16 Tom Hutchinson sent the ATRC a request for some special	

	ment request	<p>meas. MDU items.</p> <p>2/22 F called Tom re: special meas. request - will send info by fax ASAP.</p> <p>2/28 Sent price quote to Tom for special order items and requested patterns.</p> <p>3/1 Tom called and is Fed X'g pattern by 3/2.</p> <p>3/2 Rc'd SPO.</p> <p>3/3 Rc'd spec. msrmt. pattern.</p>	<p>3/17 Order shipped.</p>
3/15	Order gfm for Small Purchase Order (SPO)	<p>3/15 F called Lisa R. about going ahead and ordering the gfm - Lisa said OK - place order with Mamie Brown.</p> <p>3/16 F ordered gfm for tunic/slack/skirt.</p> <p>3/17 F ordered GFM for both shirts.</p> <p>3/21 F e-m Lisa about when will the gfm be shipped.</p> <p>3/22 Lisa called F - shipment going out today.</p>	<p>3/29 & 3/30 Rc'd gfm.</p>
3/30	Request accelerated delivery date - on tunics and shirts	<p>3/30 F called Pat Martin requesting an accelerated delivery date on the tunics.</p> <p>4/3 Approval for accelerated delivery date received.</p> <p>4/3 Pat sent a list of maternity shirts that are needed by DSCP as soon as possible.</p>	<p>4/18 & 4/27 Items shipped.</p>
4/26	Quantity changes on selected items/sizes	<p>4/26 Lisa e-m F to request order qty. changes on slacks, tunic, s/s and l/s shirts.</p> <p>4/26 F e-m L. Cannot decrease tunic or s/s shirt (already in production). L/s shirt and slacks can be changed. F requested mod for additional pcs.</p>	<p>4/28 F received mod for changes.</p>
4/10	Wrong address on packages to Cal Poly	<p>4/10 J called G to inform her of incorrectly addressed pkgs. to ATRC.</p> <p>4/11 F called Gwen Johnson to update records.</p> <p>4/11 J e-m T. Hutchinson regarding incorrect address.</p>	<p>4/11 Waiting to see if future pkgs. arrive to correct bldg.</p> <p>7/27 Packages</p>

			<i>have been arriving with the correct address.</i>
4/11	Received new specs and patterns for the MDU skirt	<p>4/27 Review pattern and specs - found to be inconsistent - the specs had changed in length from 30" to 31" and the new pattern sent with the new specs did not meet the new required finished measurements.</p> <p>4/28 P e-m Gail about length problem.</p> <p>5/1 P, Frank and Gail agreed the xs, sm and med size patterns are too short. Gail will ask Tom Hutchinson to send out a mod for the necessary pattern changes the ATRC will have to do to achieve the finished measurement of the specifications.</p>	<i>5/16 Rec'd mod P00004 from Tom.</i>
5/8	Possible commercial contractor	<p>5/8 J e-m Sally requesting if ATRC should pursue placing MDU with a commercial contractor.</p> <p>5/16 P e-m Sally via weekly update # 5 reminding Sally of Jean's request.</p> <p>6/30 P e-m Sally via weekly update #8.</p> <p>5/31 - 7/17 Waiting for reply.</p> <p>7/24 Pam e-m Sally in Update #10.</p>	<i>8/15 During Jean's and Pam's visit to DSCP, Sally said our help would not be needed.</i>
5/19	Shorted shipment of gfm	<p>5/19 Fran e-m Lisa for replacement of gfm yardage shortage.</p> <p>6/20 Al C. e-m Fran requesting more info re: gfm shortage.</p> <p>6/20 Fran e-m Al with info needed to process the request.</p> <p>6/22 Al e-m the gfm was on its way.</p>	<i>6/29 Received gfm.</i>
9/26	New SPO	9/26 F called Lisa R. - Lisa indicated there was a new SPO in the works.	

December 1, 1999 – November 30, 2000
Activity/Issue/Problem Log
For Marine Short Sleeve Shirt

			Resolution Date
12/14	Implement add'l handling and pressing	12/14 ATRC must implement more handling and pressing in the construction of the garment per DSCP meeting. 12/16 Pam review specs and create new sewing instructions for factory. 1/19 Pam worked with sewing module using new instructions.	12/16 New instructions completed. 1/19 New instructions fully implemented.
12/14	Restore all patterns to original	12/14 Need to restore all patterns to original - restore seam allowances and restore collar. 1/4 P worked with pattern maker.	1/4 Patterns restored to original.
12/14	Re-calibrate pocket setter	12/14 Worked with Frank G. and Jim DP.	12/14 Calibration completed.
12/14	Change to fusible interlining	12/14 Need to change to fusible interlining to reduce problem with collar. 1/18 Implemented new fusible.	1/18 Report by several ATRC collar setters - collars fit better at neckline.
12/15	Implement QC audits	12/15 New order scheduled for 1/19.	1/20 Implemented QC program on samples.
12/15	DSCP requires samples	12/15 Submit 5 to 8 shirts as samples of varying sizes to DSCP- due by 2/4. Expecting report by 2/14.	

		<p>1/20 Complete production of samples. 2/4 Samples shipped.</p> <p>3/9 J e-m J, G, F requesting written evaluation on samples submitted. 6/15 Sent samples to Gail.</p> <p>7/25 Pam submitted written defect correction report to DSCP.</p> <p>8/16 ATRC sent Gail samples.</p>	<p>2/24 Jim and Gail hand carried to the ATRC an oral report. 3/10 Received e-m from Gail with evaluation. 7/20 Received June's evaluation w/ comments for correction from Gail via e-m. ATRC must make corrections on factory floor and send write up of corrections to Gail ASAP. ***8/31 Waiting for evaluation of Aug. samples and the return of June samples.</p>
2/2	<p>Determine means to get D. O. from DSCP - for Feb.</p>	<p>2/2 J e-m Al Carter - send shirts to 32nd St - make D. O. process easier. 2/3 Al answered - set up conf. call. 2/4 Phone call with Al, J, D, P - f/u with e-m. 2/4 J e-m Al ATRC current inventory of shirts. 3/2 F called Al Carter w/inventory of shirts & asked for D.O. to ship these. Al said it would take him 1 week to do paper-work. 3/3 Al Carter called F and said he</p>	

		<p>cannot process the D.O. - that J should speak to Sue Napoli and Ann Beecroft for their approval to ship these items. Al said that he was told there was a problem with the collars on the shirt and that if these were produced prior to Frank Giordano's approval of samples 2 weeks ago then he cannot issue a D.O. until J speaks to Sue and Ann.</p> <p>3/10 E-m from Jim asking if shirts are same as the samples produced.</p> <p>3/10 J e-m Jim - shirts are like samples.</p> <p>3/10 E-m from Jim - can't send shirts yet - are shirts from the same production that the samples were from?</p> <p>3/10 Julie, Kathy Moore & J - on phone to work out how to get the D.O. - one for whole year is better than one each month.</p> <p>3/14 E-m from Ann B. that Brian will do a D.O. for the year.</p> <p>3/15 J talk to Kathy M. - clarification on info in Ann's e-m about Al determining the sizes.</p>	<p><i>3/9 J e-m Sally, Ann, Sue, Jim, Al - asked permission to ship shirts based on 2/24 review - results were shirts are OK.</i></p> <p><i>4/6 Order rc'd. 4/10 Shipped the D.O.</i></p>
4/8	UPC mod request	<p>4/8 Ann B. e-m Brian re: UPC to be used on end items.</p> <p>5/18 Brian said he would send out bilateral mod with changes to spec.</p> <p>5/18 J e-m Brian about the mod for contract 1012.</p> <p>5/26 B faxed J 1st 6 pages of bilateral mod - hard copy to follow in mail.</p> <p>6/2 B e-m J hard copy was mailed.</p> <p>7/26 F sent Al a sample of the UPC per mod for future production. No UPC codes were provided in mod.</p> <p>7/28 Fran received from Al via fax actual UPC codes not listed in mod.</p> <p>7/28 Fran will send Al a sample of the new label with actual UPC code as soon as it is available.</p>	<p><i>6/3 Received hard copy. 6/7 Signed and returned to DSCP.</i></p>

		8/3 Fran faxed Al new UPC label.	8/7 Al called Fran and OK'd the new UPC label.
7/26	Ship date extension	7/26 Fran called Al for an extension of ship date to 8/9 for demo shirt due to machine problems. 7/27 Waiting to ship on 8/9.	7/26 Al said OK for an 8/9 ship. 8/9 Shipped July's shipment.
8/2	Ordered gfm	8/2 Fran placed order with Mamie Brown. 8/14 Jean and Pam asked Al regarding order - Al had it in his hands and said he was forwarding order on to Albany to be sent. 8/21 Fran again called Al regarding gfm order - Al said it left Albany 8/21.	8/24 Received gfm.
9/6	Ship date extension	9/6 Pam e-m Al on extensions to ship dates - Aug 9/15, Sept 9/22, Oct 10 16 OK.	9/6 Ship date extensions approved.
9/14	Order gfm (for Oct/Nov)	9/14 F ordered gfm for shirts for balance of Oct. and Nov. production. 9/14 F called Al Carter to confirm gfm request. Al confirmed but said our address was deleted from their system & he would have to re-enter it before cloth could be shipped. 10/2 F called Al to check on the gfm - Al said the order was sent to Burlington - he would have to re-submit the request to Albany. 10/12 F e-m Al to check on the gfm again - order was placed Sept. 14. 10/17 Al C. e-m F and said gfm shipped 10/13 from Albany-ETA - 10/20.	10/20 Fabric received.
10/18	Order gfm (for Dec)	10/18 F e-m Al C. to advise of gfm request faxed today for Dec. order. 10/26 F e-m Al C. re: gfm request -	

		<p>have not heard back.</p> <p>10/27 Al C. e-m F and said cloth was ordered and should be shipped soon. Al suggested F e-m all the info for the gfm request to Mamie Brown and cc him. Mamie would then write up the requisition, etc. for a faster release of gfm goods.</p> <p>10/31 F e-m Al re: his request for gfm forms via e-m. ATRC would still fill out hard copies and fax to him/Mamie but would advise by e-m when these are sent.</p> <p>11/1 Al C. e-m F to see if gfm had arrived.</p> <p>11/2 F e-m answer to Al - not yet.</p>	<p><i>11/6 Gfm fabric arrived at ATRC.</i></p>
--	--	---	--

Appendix E

List of Published Articles about the ATRC

Articles:

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------|
| 1. "OPD Coordinates Holiday Food Drive for Local Residents" | Oceanside Magazine | 12/98 |
| 2. Interview for apparel article | Forbes Magazine | 01/99 |
| 3. "Keeping up with CAD" | California Apparel News | 02/99 |
| 4. "ATRC Program" | Inland Valley Bulletin | 03/99 |
| 5. "What's in a Cluster" | California Apparel News | 03/99 |
| 6. "Cal Poly Program Everything it Seams" | Inland Valley Bulletin | 04/99 |
| 7. "Dayton Hudson Teams with Cal Poly to Train Contractors" | California Apparel News | 05/99 |
| 8. "ATRC Teams with Dayton Hudson to Train Contractors" | Cal Poly Bulletin | 07/99 |
| 9. "Selling Her Shoe Designs Will Take Some Work" | Los Angeles Times | 08/99 |
| 10. "News About the ATRC" | CP Foundation News | 10/99 |
| 11. "Textile Notes" | California Apparel News | 12/99 |
| 12. "ATRC Retailer-Manufacturer Panel" | Cal Poly Bulletin | 01/00 |
| 13. "ATRC Activities" | CP Foundation News | 03/00 |
| 14. "Full Package Seminar Draws" | California Apparel News | 05/00 |
| 15. "Speed is Life" | California Apparel News | 06/00 |

Appendix F
List of Presentations

Presentations:

- | | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. 01/99 | "The American Apparel Industry" | El Monte Chamber of
Commerce - Chinese
Delegation - group of 30 |
| 2. 03/99 | "American Apparel
Manufacturing" | USDOC-Russian Mfg. Study
Tour Group - group of 30 |
| 3. 03/99 | "Virtual Prime Vendor" | General Mungeon - DSCP |
| 4. 09/99 | "Apparel Manufacturing" | West Coast Fashion Summit -
group of 25 |
| 5. 10/99 | "Virtual Prime Vendor" | International Logistics
Conference - group of 35 |
| 6. 03/00 | "Virtual Prime Vendor" | MCRD - San Diego - group
of 10 |
| 7. 03/00 | "Full Package Contracting" | Korean American Garment
Industry Assn. - group of 75 |
| 8. 03/00 | "Virtual Prime Vendor" | MCRD-San Diego - group
of 9 |
| 9. 05/00 | "ATRC Activities" | CA Trade & Commerce
Apparel Industry Forum
- group of 75 |
| 10. 05/00 | "Quality Assurance Programs" | Apparel Contractor's Alliance
of California Annual
Convention - group of 100 |
| 11. 06/00 | "The American Apparel Industry" | Gifu Sewing Assoc. (Japan) -
group of 30 |
| 12. 07/00 | "ATRC Program" | Greater Pomona Kiwanis Club
- group of 15 |
| 13. 08/00 | "ATRC Program" | Pomona Kiwanis Club - group
of 15 |

Appendix G
Coalition Members

Coalition Members 1998 - 2000

First	Last	Company	Company Type
Ernest	Aguilar	Lancaster Uniform Cap Co.	Manufacturer
Robert	Atkinson	Coats American	T/N&F Supp
B. James	Bottoms	Chorus Line Corporation	Manufacturer
Burt	Brooks	Brooks Industries	T/N&F Supp
Sergio	Calvo	Grand Prix Apparel & Accessor.	Manufacturer
Jacob	Chamanian	IAN Manufacturing	Manufacturer
J. C.	Choe	Textile News	Service Org
Peggy	Chu	New Jeremy Inc.	Contractor
Barry	Cohn	Cohn Handler & Co.	Service Org
Walter	Colgan	Freudenberg West	T/N&F Supp
Sean	Coppage	YKK USA, Inc.	T/N&F Supp
Steve	Craver	Groz-Beckert USA, Inc.	T/N&F Supp
Joe	Dennison	Prudential Overall Supply	Manufacturer
Gordon	Duffy	Singer	Equip Supp
Esther	Dunbar	G.S. Dunbar & Co.	Contractor
Nancy	Edwards	Disneyland Costuming/Walt Disney Entert.	Contractor
Joel	Esmond	Sew-Forth, Inc.	Manufacturer
Scott	Espeseth	Continental Business Credit	Service Org
Fred	Freehling	Darbo Manufacturing Company	Manufacturer
Richard	Gold	Juki Union Special, Inc.	Equip Supp
Rodney	Harrelson	Lectra	Equip Supp
Tom	Higgins	Heller Financial	Service Org
J.P.	Jardin	Computer Consulting & Software	Softwre Supp
Susan	Jeffrey	The Sewing Company/B.C. Breakfield Enterprises, Inc.	Contractor
Gary K.	Jue	Amer Chin Gar Contr Asso of So Calif	Service Org
Mark	Klein	Lunada Bay	Manufacturer
Calvin	Lee	Kimberly Enterprises	Contractor
Casey	Lee	The Genesis Company	T/N&F Supp
Matthew	Lenoci	Matteo Fine Bed Linens	Manufacturer
Tommy	Leung	Heller Financial	Bus Assist
Mitchel	Maeng	Apparel Roundtable & Assoc.	Service Org
Steven	Mandel	Smith Mandel & Associates, LLP	Bus Assist
Danny	Marrujo	Baby Bias Co.	T/N&F Supp
Mark	McElrath	Da-Rue of California	Manufacturer
Cardie	Molina	Oilcloth International	Manufacturer
Stephen	Nitzberg	Lorber Industries of California	Textile Supp
Don	Owen	California Joy, Inc.	Contractor
Dean	Planeaux	Heller Financial	Bus Assist
Sal	Prizzi	Prizzi Sewing Machine Company	Equip Supp

Silvio	Quintas	Best Washington Uniform & Linen&Supply	Manufacturer
Robert	Reed	Stitches, Inc.	Contractor
Art	Resendez	Dai-Ichi Kangyo Bank	Bus Assist
Joe	Rodriguez	Garment Contractors Assoc.	Service Org
Jeff	Rudin	Quail Leasing	Bus Assist
Christine	Samuelian	Southern California Edison	Bus Assist
Ricardo	Slutzki	Colman Saks, Inc.	Softwre Supp
Michael	Spann, Jr.	M.S. Sales Company, Inc.	Textile Supp
Steve	Sternberger	Autometrix	Equip Supp
Ian	Stonehouse	Mark Cutting & Fusing	Contractor
Ron	Tanzman	Aptan Corporation	T/N&F Supp
Jack	Tasso	TSR Yarns, Inc.	Textile Supp
Jeff	Waldman	Security Textile Corporation	T/N&F Supp
Jennifer	Weindorf	Grand Prix Apparel & Accessor.	Manufacturer
Robert	Whitehead	AMZ Packaging	T/N&F Supp
Martin	Wicksman	Martin Wicksman Pattern Service	Contractor
Janette	Williams	Quality Assurance Consulting	Bus Assist
Willie	Wilson	Mar-Am Insurance	Bus Assist

Appendix H

**Virtual Prime Vendor
Activity Logs**

December 1, 1999 - November 30, 2000
Activity/Issue/Problem Log
For ASAPWeb

3/31	<p>WIP & FG from old to new CAGE code</p>	<p>3/31 Called Mike - left message concerning the moving of inventory in WIP & FG when contracts move from old CAGE to new.</p> <p>3/31 WIP & FG entered for PGCs 02346 & 02347.</p> <p>4/17 WIP & FG entered for PGCs 01887 & 02355.</p> <p>4/19 WIP & FG entered for PGC 02345.</p> <p>4/25 WIP & FG for PGCs 01865 & 01866 have not moved to the new CAGE code.</p>	<p>3/31 Mike stated it would be more work for him than it would be to have Ana enter them manually. Informed Ana.</p>	
	<p>Progress of move for CAGE code change</p>	<p>4/3 Reviewed CAGE Codes in ASAPWeb. For contracts with new orders the PGC has been moved to the new CAGE code.</p> <p>4/3 Asked Fran to verify PGCs that have not moved to new CAGE code.</p> <p>4/5 Reviewed CAGE codes and PGCs.</p> <p>4/17 Reviewed CAGE codes and PGCs.</p> <p>Only two PGCs have not moved to 2F321. These are 01865 & 01866, both have WIP & FG counts in 0ZQ46.</p>	<p>4/3 Fran checked & verified that PGCs are old or contract is completed.</p>	
	<p>Manually create DD250 for</p>	<p>4/26 DD250 were sent out today using order numbers 0402, 0403 and 0384. These order numbers have not moved from the old CAGE to the new. The PGCs are 01865 and 01866. The DD250s</p>		

PGCs 01865 & 01866	<p>were not sent through ASAPWeb since the PGCs have not moved. Contacted Mike and he reviewed the data in AAVS and noted that they have not changed according to the information coming from SAMMS. Called Debbie Schroeder at Cal Poly Foundation to notify her of this situation. She gave me the name of Bob Krejci at DSCP.</p> <p>4/27 Called Bob Krejci -left a message to return call. 4/27 Bob Krejci returned call - discussed the problem with PGCs 01865 & 01866 not being shown in SAMMS under the new CAGE code. Gave him Mike's number so he could talk to him more in depth about ASAPWeb. Bob stated that he wasn't sure how to fix the problem but would do some research and call back next week. 4/28 Bob Krejci called for some other information on the PGCs discussed on Thursday. Will do some checking and get back early next week. 5/2 Bob called for more information about the PGCs 01865 & 01866. He asked for an order number for anything else that was shipped under contract 1012. Gave him info on order number 0439. He will check into why PGC 01887 moved and the others have not - will call when he finds something out.</p>
Contact DSCP I. M. about PGCs not moving from CAGE code 0ZQ46 to 2F321	

		<p>being made. 4/27 Sent letter to inform of DD250 availability. 6/15 E-m POC offering assistance with DD250. 8/14 E-m POC about getting approval for production of DD250. 10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p>	
4/1	Talladega Industries for the Blind	<p>4/1 Waiting on Army contract. 5/9 E-m from Bernie with POC name. 5/18 Updated manufacturer's</p>	

		log with POC information. 10/4 E-m Bernie for status on working with DAM.
1/5	Travis Assn. for the Blind Travis	1/5 Called POC, Jerry Mayfield, and left message. 1/10 Called POC and left message. 1/16 Jerry called - Alice Williams will be using the system. 1/20 Jerry called about getting access for Alice to use system.

Travis

system.

1/31

Jerry
called
having
problem
getting
into
site
with
password.

1/31

Called
Mike
about
trouble

-
checked
password

Jerry
gave
me.

Mike
informed
me
that
the
password
had
been
changed
and
gave
me
the
new
information.

1/31

Called
Jerry
with
password
needed.

4/6

Called
about
using
DD250

11/9

Bs
removed
from
description.

Jerry
was
busy
and
asked
to
call
him
back
at
a
later
date.
4/27
Sent
letter
to
inform
of
DD250
availability.
5/17
Called
POC
-
out
of
office.
Talked
to
Tim
about
setting
up
DD250
and
acquiring
a
WInS
account.
Tim
will
have
POC
call
on
5/22.
5/26

Called
again
-
left
message.
6/15
E-m
POC
in
ASAPWeb
offering
assistance
with
DD250.
10/4
E-m
about
DD250
and
ASAPWeb.
10/24
Called
POC
-
we
discussed
using
the
system.
There
was
a
problem
with
the
admin
account.
Checked
info
with
PDIT.
E-m
POC
-
corrected
info
for
use

by
Travis.
Will
call
11/7.
11/7
Called
POC
and
not
in
-
left
message
to
return
call.
11/7
Discovered
the
addition
of
the
letter
B
on
the
descriptions
of
Travis'
NSNs.
Contacted
PDIT
to
ask
for
their
removal.
11/13
Called
POC
and
setup
appt.
for
a
later
date.

11/15

Called

POC

-

assisted

with

WIP

&

FG

and

creating

DD250.

Discovered

that

there

was

a

problem

with

the

software

concerning

the

"enter"

button

and

the

DD250.

If

"enter"

key

is

pressed

when

entering

information

into

the

DD250

template,

the

DD250

opens

without

adding

the

required

fields.

		This problem was relayed to PDIT. 11/15 POC asked how many characters can be added to block 23.
1 /4	Unicor Federal Prison Industries	1/4 Sent e-m to Bernie for information on Unicor POC. 1/13 Received e-m from Bernie on POC for Unicor. 1/18 Called POC, Paul Haight, and left message. 1/20 Called Paul about
	Unicor	

about
setting
up
user
accounts.
Discussed
the
fact
that
they
have
three
plants
and
need
to
compile
information
before
entering
it
into
the
system.

He
asked
about
using
the
DD250.

2/14
Called
POC
and
line
busy.

2/28
Called
POC
and
line
busy.

3/1
Paul
called
asked
for
user
and
password

Unicor

	Crown Clothing	<p>removing DD250 per POCs request.</p> <p>6/15 E-m POC that work is progressing toward electronic DD250 production approval.</p> <p>8/14 E-m to POC about submitting DD250 for production approval.</p> <p>8/28 E-m again offering to help with production approval.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p> <p>10/30 E-m POC that WIP & FG not being updated as required and to inquire if Crown interested in completing the DD250 section.</p> <p>11/27 Call from POC - reestablished user account and discussed entering WIP & FG. Will call later to discuss the DD250 section.</p> <p>11/28 Call from POC - discussed the GFM pricing using WInS system, a need for block 21 to be editable, and the extra work by having to manually enter the inventories in the WIP & FG. Informed POC that it was only required once a week or when changes occurred. POC said they have changes on a daily basis since they ship daily. POC informed me that he had a call into someone at DSCP to discuss using ASAPWeb. POC unhappy that he cannot edit block 16 to make the information the way he wants. Tried to explain that some of the info he was entering can be added but in a different way.</p> <p>11/28 E-m POC about the</p>	<p><i>9/5 No response from POC.</i></p>
--	-----------------------	--	---

		problem with GFM and that will not be able to send any MOCAS contracts that have GFM prices using ASAPWeb. Again replied that his entire contract requires he enter his inventory and if he wants to pursue the DD250 to contact me. Will call him again after the 1 st of the year.	
4/1	Derossi and Son Co.	<p>4/1 Waiting on Army contract.</p> <p>5/9 E-m from Bernie - POC name.</p> <p>5/18 Updated manufacturer's log with POC information.</p> <p>10/4 E-m Bernie for status on working with DAM.</p> <p>11/15 Call from POC - gave her website address and administrator information. She had a browser problem since they are using AOL - will contact PDIT.</p> <p>11/15 Talked to Mike about browser problem.</p> <p>11/15 Called POC - left message how to overcome browser problem.</p> <p>11/16 Returned call from POC. She was trying to create a new user using the same login name and was getting an error message. Explained that duplicate users cannot be created in system. We discussed the need for the entry of QAR info in block 21, informed them would be in next version. Also discussed if ASAPWeb handled GFM prices.</p>	
12/7	EA Industries Inc.	<p>12/7 EA made contact with Mike for help.</p> <p>4/27 Sent letter to inform of DD250 availability.</p>	

		<p>6/15 Called POC - not in and left message.</p> <p>10/4 E-m Bernie for status on working with DAM</p>	
1/24	Goodwill Industries of South Florida	<p>1/24 Called POC, Diane Valencia, since site not being updated - left message.</p> <p>1/31 Checked site updates were made on 1/24.</p> <p>2/28 Called Diane - left information about FTP upload.</p> <p>3/1 E-m to all parties that no entries made in WIP & FG - may need help from DSCP getting manufacturer to enter WIP& FG.</p> <p>3/2 Call from Diane - she was under the impression that since they were Bill & Hold they need not enter WIP & FG. She will start making entries.</p> <p>4/27 Sent letter to inform of DD250 availability.</p> <p>6/15 E-m POC offering assistance with DD250.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p>	
12/13	Jockey	<p>12/13 Called POC, Julie Schutzen.</p> <p>1/5 Called POC - left message.</p> <p>1/5 Received call from Julie that she would not be the one working with the system - she will have POC call back.</p> <p>1/10 POC, Donna Knutter, called - assisted setting up users and using DD250.</p> <p>2/7 Called Donna to offer help on getting entries into system. She informed me that she had tried to use the system last week but had problems. She called PDIT - Lynne helped her with problems.</p> <p>2/7 Called Kathy again about</p>	

	Jockey	<p>participating in testing electronic DD250 and left message.</p> <p>2/7 Called Mike to check on the problems informed of by Donna.</p> <p>2/8 E-m Mike - had not heard from Jockey about DD250 participation. He stated that he had talked to POC and they were willing to participate.</p> <p>2/8 PDIT e-m informing that problem with Jockey site corrected</p> <p>3/2 E-m Mike that Jockey only manufacturer not entering WIP & FG.</p> <p>3/2 Mike replied that they are using DD250 even though they are not using WIP & FG.</p> <p>4/27 Sent letter to inform of DD250 availability.</p> <p>6/6 E-m to POC offering help for getting electronic DD250 production complete.</p> <p>6/7 E-m from POC informing the VIM that someone else would be the one to make decision and that she was forwarding my e-m to her.</p> <p>6/15 E-m to POC mentioned above about DD250/production.</p> <p>6/15 E-m from POC informing the VIM that she is not the one to make decision and that she was forwarding my e-m to correct POC.</p> <p>6/15 Replied to e-m that would give new POC a few days to reply and then make contact.</p> <p>6/21 Discussed Jockey and electronic DD250 with Mike.</p> <p>Will hold off until WAWF and</p>
--	---------------	--

	Jockey	<p>Soffee resolved.</p> <p>8/14 E-m to POC about participating in DD250 production approval.</p> <p>8/17 Call from POC about setting up DD250 for production. POC new to ASAPWeb will check on what to do and contact VIM at later date.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p> <p>10/30 E-m to Ed, POC, about WIP & FG counts.</p> <p>10/30 Call from Steve at Jockey concerning the entering of WIP & FG. Steve stated would check into and make sure counts are entered.</p> <p>11/28 E-m Ed that WIP & FG are still not being entered.</p>	<p><i>8/29 No reply as of this date. Will call again in Sept 2000.</i></p> <p><i>11/28 Ed called and said he would get it taken care of.</i></p>
4/1	National Industries for the Blind (NIB) - Government Operations 5M888	<p>4/1 Waiting on Army contract.</p> <p>5/9 E-m from Bernie - POC name</p> <p>5/18 Updated manufacturer's log with POC information.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb to Kathy (5M888) at PC (Prime Contractor).</p> <p>10/4 E-m to (9X233) POC about ASAPWeb WIP & FG.</p> <p>10/4 Reply from (9X233) date set to do WIP & FG at their location.</p> <p>10/10 Call from 9X233. Assisted with setup of users, WIP & FG and other sections of ASAPWeb.</p> <p>Users were not able to log into the 83421 site assigned - POC at 9X233 stated that was an old CAGE code and not being used. VIM logged in under admin account and noted no contracts in system. Informed</p>	

	NIB	<p>9X233 to use PC (5M888) account.</p> <p>10/10 Discussed the CAGE code mystery with PDIT.</p> <p>10/11 E-m 9X233 about discussion with PDIT about subject on 10/10. Explained WInS account for electronic submission. Discussed another date to work with ASAPWeb in greater detail. Date set for 10/19.</p> <p>10/19 E-m PC POC (5M888) concerning ASAPWeb and old CAGE account. Discussed block 21, 10, 8, and 13. Block concerned having inspector signature on DD250. Block 10 and 13 concern the address being listed. Block concerns coding.</p> <p>10/20 Call with POC - was informed of other subcontractors that will be entering WIP & FG. A date was set to work with this other location. Will contact PC POC at later date to work out using the DD250 section of ASAPWeb at PC. Since two subcontractors using PC site to enter WIP & FG, an arrangement needs to be made until PDIT can upgrade ASAPWeb to accommodate.</p> <p>10/23 Called POC at 2nd location (25925) - setup user account and made arrangements on how to update WIP & FG until resolution at PDIT can be made.</p> <p>10/23 E-m 1st location (9X233) about WIP & FG arrangements made until</p>	<p>10/20 Information in block 8, 10,13 correct as displayed because based on Prime Contractor info. Block 21 addressed in next releases.</p>
--	------------	--	--

	NIB	<p>resolution.</p> <p>10/23 Issue discovered when creating DD250 at (25925) with block 11 - not adding correct CAGE location- PDIT informed and will call POC when problem resolved.</p> <p>11/2 Talked to Mike about CAGE code in block 11 today. He needed to talk to POC at DSCP and will get back to me.</p> <p>11/7 E-m Kathy setting up date for talk about ASAPWeb DD250 on the 17th Nov.</p> <p>11/8 Checked issue with block 11 - still not working and contacted PDIT.</p> <p>11/17 Call from Kathy - we discussed using the DD250 and ASAPWeb. Will have a finance person contact me at later date.</p>	<p><i>11/18 E-m from PDIT - issue with block 11 resolved.</i></p>
4/1	North Bay Rehabilitation Services	<p>4/1 Waiting on Army contract.</p> <p>5/9 E-m from Bernie - POC name.</p> <p>5/18 Updated DAMs log with POC information.</p> <p>10/4 E-m Bernie for status on working with DAM.</p>	
4/1	NYSARC Inc.	<p>4/1 Waiting on Army contract.</p> <p>5/9 E-m from Bernie - POC name.</p> <p>5/18 Updated manufacturer's log with POC information.</p> <p>5/26 Call from POC concerning WIP & FG inventory - cannot get into ASAPWeb to make entries.</p> <p>5/26 E-m POC to use admin account to enter WIP & FG until info obtained. Explained "update" and "update all" buttons and not to enter Bill & Hold in FG.</p> <p>5/26 E-m Mike for user info</p>	

	NYSARC	<p>for POC.</p> <p>5/31 Mike called with info.</p> <p>5/31 E-m POC with info and what to do to correct problem.</p> <p>6/5 Call from POC for assistance changing admin and user accounts.</p> <p>6/5 Rendered assistance to the POC with the Admin account.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p> <p>10/19 E-m that will call on 10/25.</p> <p>10/25 Called Linda Longwell - discussed DD250 and WIP & FG. No Internet access at her desk. Their Internet account is shared. Will mail copy of user manual.</p> <p>11/2 Mailed users manual.</p> <p>Will call on the 8th.</p>	<p><i>11/13 Call from POC at NYSARC - they are not interested in using the DD250 at this time.</i></p>
4/1	Olympic Mills Corp.	<p>4/1 Waiting on Army contract.</p> <p>5/9 E-m from Bernie - POC name.</p> <p>5/18 Updated manufacturer's log with POC information.</p> <p>10/4 E-m Bernie for status on working with DAM.</p> <p>11/2 Will call on 11/8.</p>	
1/5	Propper Intl. Inc.	<p>1/5 Called Propper - learned that Eliod Delacruz is POC and left message.</p> <p>4/7 Sent letter to inform of DD250 availability.</p> <p>6/6 E-m to POC offering help getting electronic DD250 production complete.</p> <p>6/22 Call from new POC (Ron M.) about using ASAPWeb.</p> <p>Had admin account problems and multiple accounts.</p> <p>6/22 E-m Mike for info on admin account and to discuss multiple accounts for POC.</p>	

	Propper	<p>6/22 Called POC and left message.</p> <p>6/22 POC called to discuss admin account and what to do to combine multiple accounts.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p> <p>10/4 New POC called and stated that she will be making WIP & FG entries. Will work on DD250 at a later date.</p> <p>10/31 Talked to POC about using DD250 section. He stated he would discuss it with company and get back to me.</p> <p>11/7 E-m POC about setting up appt. on 15 Nov to discuss ASAPWeb.</p> <p>11/15 Did not get a chance to discuss DD250 with POC. Will contact after 1st of year.</p>	
1/5	Soffee MJ Co. Inc.	<p>1/5 Called POC, Hunter McMillin, and left message.</p> <p>1/10 Received call from Gwen, POC, to discuss setting up user accounts.</p> <p>2/4 Called Gwen - site was not being updated. She was out ill and left message.</p> <p>2/14 Gwen called - discussed using WIP & FG and the FTP upload system. Faxed her a copy of the booklet.</p> <p>2/17 Called Gwen about FTP booklet. She never received it - e-m a copy to her.</p> <p>2/22 Received message from Gwen that they had made entries in ASAPWeb - wants the site reviewed to insure all was correct.</p> <p>4/6 Called Gwen about using DD250 in ASAPWeb - left message.</p>	<p><i>2/22 Checked sites - e-m Gwen all looked correct. Let her know to call or e-m anytime that she may need help.</i></p>

	<p>Soffee</p>	<p>4/7 Gwen called - talked about using DD250. Requested she download the new version of system to review.</p> <p>4/26 Called Gwen about using the DD250. She setup a test DD250. Tried to work with the printer setup and had some problems - requested she download the user's manual and review the printer setup. She noted that the contractor address was incorrect and that block 16 was not entering all the information that they do. Asked her to fax a copy of the DD250 she created and a copy of a DD250 prepared manually.</p> <p>4/26 Received the copies of the DD250 and faxed them to Mike.</p> <p>4/26 Called Mike - discussed the address error and the missing information in block 16.</p> <p>4/26 Mike e-m that they had corrected the information in their system but Soffee needed to correct the address in DFAS. E-m address to accomplish the change at DFAS to Gwen along with an explanation about the information in block 16. Explained what was happening about the sizes for block 16 and that for the time being she could use the "remarks" block to enter the sizes manually until it's corrected in ASAPWeb.</p> <p>4/27 Sent letter to inform of DD250 availability.</p>
--	----------------------	---

	Soffee	<p>5/8 E-m POC instructions to setup WInS account.</p> <p>5/15 E-m POC - will call her tomorrow to help with WInS setup.</p> <p>5/16 Called POC - assisted with WInS application, changes needed in ASAPWeb and printer setup.</p> <p>5/17 E-m printer setup instructions to POC. E-m from POC asking about transmission of DD250 and using EDI.</p> <p>5/19 Message from POC about printer setup. E-m that will call on Monday.</p> <p>5/22 E-m for time to call and assist with printer margins.</p> <p>5/22 Returned call to POC for assistance with printer setup. POC will try to work with her computer section on margins.</p> <p>5/24 Called POC - left message. E-m POC for info needed to setup WInS testing of DD250. POC e-m - needed WInS info to make needed changes in WInS account to reflect PDIT as POC.</p> <p>5/24 ASAPWeb setup for testing and DD250 submitted.</p> <p>5/31 E-m Mike if response to DD250 being submitted. Call from Mike that no word yet but would contact DFAS if no word by end of week.</p> <p>6/5 E-m Mike about response to DD250 submission.</p> <p>6/5 Mike e-m if he sent query to POC at DFAS.</p> <p>6/5 E-m from Mike that no word on Soffee production status yet.</p> <p>6/15 E-m POC that there has</p>	
--	---------------	---	--

	Soffee	<p>been no word on production.</p> <p>6/22 Discussed with PDIT production failed - took 3 weeks to get a reply from DFAS.</p> <p>8/9 Called Mike that admin account password supplied for Soffee wrong - gave him correct info.</p> <p>8/9 Logged onto Soffee site - created DD250 and changed transmission status.</p> <p>Submitted another DD250 for production approval in WInS since 1st try never was completed at the WInS end.</p> <p>8/9 E-m copy of DD250 in HTML format to Bob W.</p> <p>8/9 E-m Soffee that a second DD250 was sent for production approval and will contact them with results.</p> <p>8/21 E-m Soffee will receive update on problems with previous DD250. A second DD250 was sent from ASAPWeb for them. Will inform as to status.</p> <p>8/21 E-m from Gwen there is a new POC for Soffee.</p> <p>8/28 E-m POC & others that Soffee approved for production (WInS).</p> <p>8/29 E-m VIM & ASAPWeb info to new POC plus user manual instructions. Informed POC that ATRC will start work with them when returned from East Coast trip.</p> <p>8/30 New POC e-m reply that will review user's manual.</p> <p>9/28 E-m POC about calling tomorrow to assist with DD250 and printer setup.</p> <p>9/29 E-m from POC about</p>	
--	---------------	--	--

	<p>Soffee</p>	<p>working together on 10/2. 10/2 Call made and not in - left message. 10/12 Sent e-m to POC about setting up a date to work on DD250. 10/20 Called POC to work with new POC on DD250. POC will start using system to create DD250s. 10/23 Called POC about lack of current updates for WIP & FG. Replied will get it taken care of. 10/23 Called by the financial person concerning using ASAPWeb for electronic submission. Explained the system. 10/25 E-m from POC listed contracts Soffee will use ASAPWeb for. 10/26 E-m about WIP & FG. 10/26 E-m from POC that addresses displayed in ASAPWeb not same as paper contract. POC faxed contract to VIM who faxed to PDIT. 10/27 VIM contacted POC at DSCP about address issue on Soffee contracts. Faxed POC DSCP info. POC called later in afternoon and info in ASAPWeb wrong - relay this info to PDIT. PDIT will get together with DSCP to discuss how to correct problem in ASAPWeb. 10/27 Informed POC at Soffee to use old way until problem could be resolved. 11/7 MJ Soffee sent out 25 DD250s using ASAPWeb with no problems.</p>
--	----------------------	---

		<p>11/15 E-m PDIT on status of correcting block 13 and 14 address. E-m from PDIT that they've discovered the cause and a fix is in the process.</p> <p>11/15 E-m POC on status of resolution to addressing problem.</p> <p>11/15 Call from POC about missing CLIN. Called Mike to discuss. Soffee was faxed the update so not in ASAPWeb system yet - will check in am. on 16th.</p> <p>11/16 Reviewed contract concerning missing CLIN on 15th. CLIN is in contract today. E-m POC to make aware of this fact.</p>	
12/10	Southside Training Employment and Placement Services Inc (STEPS)	<p>12/10 Called POC - spoke to Jim Mitchell.</p> <p>1/3 Checked site - entries being made.</p> <p>1/21 Checked site - entries being made.</p> <p>4/27 Sent letter to inform of DD250 availability.</p> <p>6/15 E-m POC offering assistance with DD250.</p> <p>8/14 E-m POC about getting approval for production of DD250.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p>	8/29 No response from POC for help.
4/1	Talladega Industries for the Blind	<p>4/1 Waiting on Army contract.</p> <p>5/9 E-m from Bernie with POC name.</p> <p>5/18 Updated manufacturer's log with POC information.</p> <p>10/4 E-m Bernie for status on working with DAM.</p>	
1/5	Travis Assn. for the Blind	<p>1/5 Called POC, Jerry Mayfield, and left message.</p> <p>1/10 Called POC and left message.</p>	

	Travis	<p>1/16 Jerry called - Alice Williams will be using the system.</p> <p>1/20 Jerry called about getting access for Alice to use system.</p> <p>1/31 Jerry called having problem getting into site with password.</p> <p>1/31 Called Mike about trouble - checked password Jerry gave me. Mike informed me that the password had been changed and gave me the new information.</p> <p>1/31 Called Jerry with password needed.</p> <p>4/6 Called about using DD250 - Jerry was busy and asked to call him back at a later date.</p> <p>4/27 Sent letter to inform of DD250 availability.</p> <p>5/17 Called POC - out of office. Talked to Tim about setting up DD250 and acquiring a WInS account. Tim will have POC call on 5/22.</p> <p>5/26 Called again - left message.</p> <p>6/15 E-m POC in ASAPWeb offering assistance with DD250.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p> <p>10/24 Called POC - we discussed using the system. There was a problem with the admin account. Checked info with PDIT. E-m POC - corrected info for use by Travis. Will call 11/7.</p> <p>11/7 Called POC and not in - left message to return call.</p>
--	---------------	---

	Travis	<p>11/7 Discovered the addition of the letter B on the descriptions of Travis' NSNs. Contacted PDIT to ask for their removal.</p> <p>11/13 Called POC and setup appt. for a later date.</p> <p>11/15 Called POC - assisted with WIP & FG and creating DD250. Discovered that there was a problem with the software concerning the "enter" button and the DD250. If "enter" key is pressed when entering information into the DD250 template, the DD250 opens without adding the required fields. This problem was relayed to PDIT.</p> <p>11/15 POC asked how many characters can be added to block 23.</p>	<p><i>11/9 Bs removed from description.</i></p>
1 / 4	Unicor Federal Prison Industries	<p>1/4 Sent e-m to Bernie for information on Unicor POC.</p> <p>1/13 Received e-m from Bernie on POC for Unicor.</p> <p>1/18 Called POC, Paul Haight, and left message.</p> <p>1/20 Called Paul about setting up user accounts. Discussed the fact that they have three plants and need to compile information before entering it into the system. He asked about using the DD250.</p> <p>2/14 Called POC and line busy.</p> <p>2/28 Called POC and line busy.</p> <p>3/1 Paul called asked for user and password information since he lost letter sent to him.</p> <p>3/1 Called Mike for information needed.</p>	

	Unicor	<p>3/1 Mike called with information.</p> <p>3/1 Called Paul with information.</p> <p>3/1 Paul called again for assistance with FTP, updating WIP & FG, the DD250 and updating entries using "update" or "update all".</p> <p>4/27 Sent letter to inform of DD250 availability.</p> <p>5/17 E-m POC offering assistance with DD250 setup.</p> <p>5/23 E-m from POC that they are busy at the moment with other projects - will contact after Sept 30 about using DD250.</p> <p>6/21 Call from POC/Army about problem with ASAPWeb.</p> <p>6/21 Returned call - left message.</p> <p>6/22 Called POC/Army - left message.</p> <p>6/22 E-m not working for POC.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p> <p>10/24 E-m Paul for POC info since my email not working. Sent e-m to wrong address again.</p> <p>10/31 Called POC Steve about using DD250.</p> <p>11/2 Called POC - he asked that I send some info on the system.</p> <p>We talked about the size of their enterprise. E-m a description of system abilities.</p> <p>11/6 Message from POC - returned call but gone for day. Will call 11/7.</p> <p>11/7 Called POC - answered questions concerning</p>
--	---------------	---

	<p>Unicor</p>	<p>contracts included in system and what needs to be done to start at one location. Unicor is in the process of decentralizing their accounting. Each location will be accountable for submitting their respective DD250s for payment. Will meet with other company officials and get back.</p> <p>11/20 Spoke to POC about shipment numbers from numerous locations. Gave information to second POC. Asked if a usernames could be selected in WInS application. Will check! Asked how they would handle DD250s from numerous locations and a central processing office until centralization is disbanded. Test location will be Manchester plant. Explained that each location will be able to setup own section for WIP & FG and creation of DD250s in next version. Talked about the correct CAGE for PC of Unicor. At present time 82125 is prime and listed as such in ASAPWeb.</p> <p>11/22 Call from POC asking if each location would need a separate account in WInS. Will check on that and get back. Also asked if DFAS does not receive a DD250 from the receiving location within a week does Unicor have to resubmit the DD250?</p> <p>11/28 Call from POC - informed that user ids from WInS system are assigned automatically and cannot be</p>
--	----------------------	--

	Unicor	created or changed by the user.	
12/7	Union Underwear Co. Inc.	<p>12/7 Called POC, Frieda Friedli, and left message.</p> <p>12/21 Frieda called to discuss status of contract for Union.</p> <p>12/21 E-m Bernie and Mike about contract status for Union - no contract for Marine Corp.</p> <p>4/1 Waiting on Army contracts.</p> <p>5/17 E-m Bernie about contract info.</p> <p>5/18 E-m from Bernie - still no contract.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p> <p>10/23 Called POC left message. Will call on 11/17 again.</p> <p>11/17 E-m Bernie about not being able to contact POC at Union and if active contract for them.</p>	<i>12/21 Will not contact unless new contract established.</i>
4/1	Wolverine World Wide Inc.	<p>4/1 Waiting on Army contract.</p> <p>5/9 E-m from Bernie - POC name.</p> <p>5/18 Updated manufacturer's log with POC information.</p> <p>5/22 Call from POC about unfamiliar PGCs loading in their WIP & FG section. Asked POC to check DD250 section for contract and corresponding NSNs.</p> <p>5/22 Called PDIT to discuss PGC issue.</p> <p>5/24 E-m from PDIT to POC and Bernie informing them that Wolverine does not have an active ARMY contract.</p> <p>10/4 E-m about DD250 and ASAPWeb.</p> <p>10/4 Reply that they are ready</p>	

	Wolverine	<p>to use if information is there. POC will check and contact at later date.</p> <p>10/12 Checked with PDIT and AAVS DataMart and contracts available to use. E-m POC at Wolverine to that fact.</p> <p>10/13 Called POC and discussed user ID and password. POC will contact at a later date.</p> <p>10/20 E-m about active contracts and setup to call late November concerning DD250 function.</p> <p>11/27 Spoke with POC about contracts and PGCs. Retrieved a list of current Army & Marine Corp contracts and e-m to POC.</p>	<p><i>11/28 E-m from POC that was confused about contract info sent. Replied will check - he called back and said everything was correct and he would start entering the WIP & FG inventories.</i></p>
6/6	Admin accounts for manufacturers	<p>6/6 Checked all admin account info for manufacturers. Unable to gain entry to a few. E-m PDIT for help.</p> <p>6/7 E-m from PDIT with manf. admin account info.</p>	<p><i>6/8 Verified info - noted accounts still having problems and e-m PDIT to that fact.</i></p>
6/7	Manufacturers with identical names but different CAGE codes	<p>6/7 E-m PDIT asking for some distinguishing mark on the names in ASAPWeb.</p> <p>6/7 E-m from PDIT that the CAGE code was added to the end of manf. name to help</p>	

		distinguish them.	
8/22	SAMCO	<p>8/22 Called POC and setup appt. to visit on Sept. 20 to assist with ASAPWeb and WInS.</p> <p>8/28 E-m itineraries for visit plus instructions on setting up a WInS account and Java.</p> <p>8/31 Call from POC requesting help with setting up WInS account. Needed to update browser. Assisted with browser update and WInS setup.</p> <p>9/5 E-m from POC that WInS account info received.</p> <p>9/8 Called POC - assisted with setup of user accounts.</p> <p>9/20 Worked with POC to use WIP, FG and DD250. Created DD250 and sent while there.</p> <p>9/21 DD250 was rejected - will check with PDIT as to reason.</p> <p>9/28 Called POC and created another DD250 to submit for testing and production approval.</p> <p>9/29 E-m from POC that 2nd DD250 rejected. Informed Mike at PDIT.</p> <p>9/29 E-m information POC needed to create a second CAGE code for Ship From block.</p> <p>10/3 A 3rd DD250 has been created and submitted for testing.</p> <p>10/5 Had discussion with POC about WInS system requirements for testing and production approval. A misunderstanding of instructions on WInS site was settled.</p> <p>10/10 E-m POC about status</p>	

	SAMCO	<p>of DD250 submitted on 10/5 - no word yet.</p> <p>10/12 Checked status with POC - e-m reply of no word.</p> <p>10/16 E-m POC information on VPIS's website as FYI.</p> <p>Reply from POC that they are busy - contact in Nov. to continue work.</p> <p>11/2 E-m POC about continuing work with DD250.</p> <p>11/2 E-mail from POC to contact next week.</p>	<p><i>11/17 Called POC - not in so talked to owner. They're very busy at the moment. Will contact them after first of the year.</i></p>
10/12	Peckham Vocational Industries	<p>10/12 E-m to DAM about notification from PDIT and VIM.</p> <p>10/12 Reply with information about POC.</p> <p>10/20 Called POC - left message.</p> <p>10/31 E-m to POC about working with her on the system.</p> <p>11/26 Called and left message with POC.</p>	<p><i>11/27 E-m to POC - made several attempts to work with her or the POC on ASAPWeb with no response - cc to the first POC also. May need intervention by DSCP to get a response. They are the designated manufacturer to</i></p>

			<i>work with on DAMES.</i>
1/5	JH Rutter-Rex Mfg. Co. Inc.	<p>1/5 Called POC, Dan McConnell, and left message.</p> <p>1/5 Dan returned call - stated real busy and will get to ASAPWeb ASAP.</p> <p>1/10 Called Dan - discussed WIP & FG.</p> <p>1/28 Received call from Dan - informed me that he was told to get site updated. Informed me that site would be updated by 1/31. Sent him instructions on using FTP.</p> <p>1/31 Checked site entries have been made.</p> <p>2/7 Called Dan about being one of the DAMs testing the electronic DD250. He stated he would have to check on that and would get back to me. Dan asked numerous questions - need to get the answers and return his call.</p> <p>2/7 Called Mike and discussed questions posed by Dan. Mike agreed to call Dan back and help him.</p> <p>2/21 Dan called stating that they would be part of DD250 testing.</p> <p>2/21 E-m Mike and informed him that Rutter-Rex will participate in DD250 testing.</p>	<p><i>2/28 Informed at VPV meeting that Rutter-Rex would be working with CAR now due to the systems they are working on together.</i></p>

		<p>WIP & FG entries. Will work on DD250 at a later date.</p> <p>10/10 E-m POC about lack of entry in WIP & FG for this company.</p> <p>10/11 E-m from POC that WIP & FG entered today.</p> <p>10/11 Replied asking when can assist with DD250 and WInS account.</p> <p>10/11 E-m from POC asking questions about label scheduling in ASAPWeb.</p> <p>10/11 E-m replied and explained features in next version.</p> <p>10/31 Spoke to POC about this account. No longer viable account. Contacted Mike and had account removed from ASAPWeb.</p>	
--	--	---	--

December 1, 1999 - November 30, 2000
Activity/Issue/Problem Log
For AAVS DataMart

12/9	ACF Table	12/9 E-m Diane at DSCP for information on I. M. that deal with Marine Corp items.	<i>12/10 Diane e-m a few names and a website address to locate I. M s and items they're responsible for.</i>
12/14	Manufacturer's table	12/14 Table is not being updated in MDB format due to the size of the data. E-m Mike to have a smaller version with only tables that I would need to work with. 5/31 Receiving tables containing WIP & FG inventories.	<i>5/31 Information in manufacturer table is all that is needed by VIM.</i>
12/15	Historical data	12/15 E-m Mike about historical data not being updated. Mike replied that it would be January before they can update the data because of other requirements at the moment. 5/31 Data is not being included in table VIM is receiving. Discussed with PDIT that the information is not needed.	<i>5/31 Historical data is not needed by VIM at ATRC. Will not pursue addition to AAVS DataMart.</i>
2/1	Tables in AAVS DataMart	2/1 E-m Mike about getting the AAVS DataMart tables in MDB format to retrieve information	<i>2/21 Received tables in MDB format. A daily</i>

	Tables in AAVS DataMart - condensed version	<p>needed.</p> <p>2/21 Will download tables daily - only making entries if problems with download.</p> <p>4/3 E-m Mike to have CAGE codes table added to DataMart.</p> <p>4/7 E-m Mike to add manufacturer's status to DataMart.</p> <p>4/8 Mike e-m that requested tables have been added to DataMart.</p> <p>4/27 CAGE code & size table not in AAVS tables. Called Mike to inform him.</p> <p>5/3 Talked to Mike again about CAGE code & size tables being empty. He thought it maybe the size but will check.</p> <p>5/8 Received e-m from PDIT that the CAGE code and size tables have been added to AAVS DataMart.</p> <p>5/31 Tables in AAVS DataMart are a stripped down version containing only information that can be used by the VIM at ATRC. If need data other than is in tables, PDIT is contacted and the information is sent to VIM.</p>	<p><i>update is downloaded at ATRC.</i></p> <p><i>4/8 Checked download and tables are there.</i></p> <p><i>5/31 Information in AAVS DataMart tables at sufficient level for use by VIM.</i></p>
3/27	Tracking PGC	<p>3/27 Perform primary sorts of PGCs from data sent by PDIT and Advantech, Inc.</p> <p>3/29 Created and updated needed tables.</p> <p>5/31 Work has been delayed on the PGC tracking since March due to VIM working with ASAPWeb at ATRC and with manufacturers. When discussed at quarterly review was decided that tracking would be done only if time permitted.</p>	
7/14	Fast pay indicator	7/14 Discussed the varying length of time before a DD250 is paid.	

		<p>Mike asked me to check fast pay indicator.</p> <p>7/14 Ran access query for fast pay indicators for ATRC contracts and SPO.</p> <p>8/29 Fast pay indicators don't seem to verify or deny that payment is received sooner.</p>	
7/14	GFM indicator	7/14 Been having problems with prices in DD250s - ran an access query for GFM indicators for all PGCs ATRC has.	
8/10	Army & Coast Guard information	8/10 E-m Mike about access to Army and Coast Guard information in DataMart.	<i>8/10 Mike e-m that data is too large, but should be available on VIM site soon.</i>
8/30	PGC Information - all armed forces dress shirts	8/30 E-m from Mike with shirt PGC info found in AAVS.	

December 1, 1999 - November 30, 2000
Activity/Issue/Problem Log
For VIM Site

1/25	VIM site availability	<p>1/25 Checked VIM site for possible use in VPV Demo. Site not fully functional.</p> <p>2/8 Spoke to Mike - informed ATRC that most of the sections should be functional in a few days.</p> <p>3/31 Site under construction.</p> <p>5/31 VIM site still under construction.</p> <p>8/28 VIM site still under construction.</p>	
7/18	VIM site assistance from ATRC	7/18 Spoke with Mike about ATRC's involvement in the VIM Internet application.	
9/15	VIM at ATRC	<p>9/15 Received user and password information to VIM site.</p> <p>9/21 Logged onto site to review information contained within.</p> <p>9/28 Logged into site - reviewed ASAPWeb compliance associated with assigned DAMs reporting erroneous data to PDIT.</p> <p>9/29 Cal Poly using VIM site several times a week to view ASAPWeb compliance.</p> <p>10/4 Logged onto site to verify ASAPWeb compliance.</p> <p>10/09 Using site to check WIP & FG updates.</p> <p>10/23 Using site to check WIP & FG updates.</p> <p>10/28 Using site to check WIP & FG updates.</p>	

December 1, 1999 - November 30, 2000
Activity/Issue/Problem Log
For Other Software Applications

		Resolution	
12/3	WInS Website - ATRC	<p>12/3 Attempted to setup a user account on WInS site. Site stated CAGE code already in use. Called Mike at PDIT about the problem.</p> <p>12/8 Setup user account for Cal Poly in WInS site.</p> <p>1/4 Call from Anna at DFAS concerning DD250. Called Mike to relay the message.</p> <p>1/23 E-m from Anna at DFAS concerning company name listed in WInS. Conferred with Mike to check name in AAVS DataMart.</p> <p>8/28 E-m POC about missing DD250s from ATRC in WInS vendor log - status of 3 that have not been forwarded since 18th.</p> <p>8/28 E-m from one POC about DD250s for ATRC. Three are being forwarded - two requested that they be resent.</p> <p>8/28 E-m PDIT to resubmit noted DD250s. PDIT resent DD250s.</p> <p>8/29 Spoke to Ana about checking WInS site few days after submission to verify in system.</p> <p>9/25 E-m from POC at DFAS requesting additional DD250s to do testing for production approval. This is first time additional paid DD250s requested.</p> <p>9/28 E-m from POC at DFAS asking to send another two paid DD250s with the resent test DD250. E-m POC and asked why a request for the other two DD250s.</p> <p>9/28 Problem with 1st submission was a programming error - PDIT</p>	<p><i>12/3 Mike returned call stating that he had to close account he created for Cal Poly with his information.</i></p> <p><i>1/23 Mike confirmed that name in WInS is correct. E-m Anna that name was correct.</i></p>

		<p>corrected problem.</p> <p>9/29 E-m from POC that a 2nd DD250 was rejected. It was for the same problem as 1st. Informed Mike at PDIT.</p> <p>10/6 Each POC at DFAS has their own set of requirements needed for testing and production approval. E-m sent to ARN partners and POC at DFAS concerning policy for working with DAMs and WInS testing and production approval.</p> <p>10/23 No one replied to e-mails sent so Cal Poly VIM will work with POC at DFAS on individual basis.</p> <p>10/28 E-m from DAM that DD250 sent on 10/26 was not showing up in the WInS website. DAM has been checking site after submitting a DD250 and noted that it is taking up to 2 days for the DD250 to show up in the system - some are not showing up at all. There is concern as to whether the WInS site is reliable concerning the submission of electronic DD250s using ASAPWeb.</p>	
9/28	Information on registration of a second CAGE code	<p>9/28 E-m POC at DLIS about procedure for 2nd CAGE code.</p> <p>9/29 E-m from POC with procedures. Forward that info to DAM in need.</p> <p>10/12 Call from Zeplon Phillips that the information I passed to DAM in getting a second CAGE code was wrong. Explained where I got the info. Was told what to do for another CAGE code by Zeplon.</p>	<p><i>10/12 Passed this info onto the DAM and apologized for the misinformation. This seems to be a problem encountered more often than desirable.</i></p>

<p>4/20</p>	<p>DFAS called about change of WInS of ATRC</p>	<p>4/20 Received a call from Judy Mills, DFAS, about the updates done to the site on Monday. Judy stated not to make the changes to the present vendor profile but to register for a new CAGE. Explained about the CAGE code mix-up. Her concern was who was listed as the point of contact under the cage 2F321. It was explained that Cal Poly Foundation is the vendor and the ATRC was the ship from site. She stated that Ann Large would need to be informed about the changes made. Informed Judy that Ann was contacted two weeks ago and she was the one who directed what changes to make on the WInS site. Informed Judy that Debbie Schroeder was the point of contact on the contract but VIM's name was on the WInS site due to the testing with the ASAPWeb site. Judy stated she would contact Ann Large and Debbie to discuss the info on the WInS site.</p>	
<p></p>	<p>Creating DD250 in WInS Software</p>	<p>4/20 Called Mike at PDIT to see if there was any concern about his name being on the site when PDIT was listed as the point of contact. He stated he had no trouble. 11/9 Cal Poly VIM created a DD250 in the WInS software application on the site. There are many similarities and differences from ASAPWeb. You need to have all your DD250 information at hand when creating a DD250 in WInS since nothing is automated. Cannot use a prepaid DD250 in the WInS application for testing that was created using ASAPWeb.</p>	<p>11/14 <i>Approval to create DD250s using the WInS application.</i></p>

5/9	CAGE Code 2F321 approved for production	<p>5/9 Call from Anne Large at DFAS as to whether DD250 was for testing or production. Verified that it was for production.</p> <p>5/12 E-m from Sheila Wright that DD250 sent on 5/8 was approved for production.</p> <p>5/15 E-m Sheila for the details of the testing - asked questions to correct procedures.</p> <p>5/15 E-m from Sheila with answers to some questions.</p> <p>5/15 Called Sheila - still have some questions unresolved from her returned e-m.</p> <p>5/15 Called Mike to discuss information from Sheila. Mike clarified some of the info Sheila spoke about.</p>	<p><i>5/12 CAGE code 2F321 approved for production with batch submission through ASAPWeb. ATRC cleared for transmission of DD250.</i></p> <p><i>5/15 CAGE code 0ZQ46 will not be used for reference in WInS.</i></p>
6/5	WInS adjustments for Soffee	<p>6/5 E-m Mike about Soffee status for production.</p> <p>6/5 E-m from Mike that he sent a query to DFAS on the status.</p> <p>7/10 No remedy to the failure of getting Soffee approved for production. Mike is handling the technical end of the production approval.</p> <p>8/9 E-m POC at DFAS and attached required HTML file for production approval for Soffee. Sent follow up e-m about Soffee production approval to POC at DFAS.</p> <p>8/14 E-m from POC at DFAS that they can't locate DD250 sent on 8/9 and they don't see account in WInS for Soffee.</p> <p>8/14 E-m POC at DFAS back that Soffee setup account in WInS end of May and that a copy of DD250 sent available at PDIT.</p>	

		<p>8/14 E-m from POC at DFAS about conference call - will call as to status.</p> <p>8/14 Call from Bob that error was Soffee listed as M.J Soffee in WInS.</p> <p>8/15 Call from Bob W. that can't locate DD250 from Soffee - asked to resubmit. Contacted PDIT and they resubmitted DD250.</p> <p>8/21 E-m from Jim K. that there was problem with DD250 from Soffee.</p> <p>8/21 Called Jim K. spoke with Sheila W. to discuss problem. DD250 already in WInS system and what to do to correct.</p> <p>8/21 Called Mike and discussed problem - informed that a new DD250 was going to created and submitted.</p> <p>8/21 New DD250 created and sent for approval per Sheila's instructions. E-m HTML document to Bob W. and new DD250 to Sheila.</p> <p>8/21 Checked WInS system to verify receipt of DD250. At 6:22pm DD250 still did not appear in system.</p> <p>8/22 E-m POC at DFAS to inquire about Soffee DD250. E-m reply there was trouble with the system - will advise when problem resolved.</p> <p>8/22 Checked WInS system at 2:00pm, Soffee DD250 in system waiting to be sent to SAMMS system.</p>	
11/7	WInS DD250s disappearing	<p>11/7 E-m ASAP list about the problem with some DD250s disappearing and not reaching the WInS processing system.</p> <p>11/8 Contacted POC at WInS to check on Apparel Mfg. missing DD250. POC checked system and couldn't find document so asked</p>	

		that the document be sent again. Contacted PDIT and they resent the DD250. Informed Apparel POC that PDIT resent the document.	
6/23	WAWF	<p>6/23 Call with Mike - discussed WAWF and what it meant to ATRC.</p> <p>7/7 Downloaded and configured viewer software needed to use the demo section. Created a DD250 to test some of the functions and capabilities of the system.</p> <p>7/10 Called Mike and discussed my experience with the functions on the system.</p> <p>9/11 WAWF on hold for time being - will discuss later as system evolves.</p> <p>10/30 Access that Cal Poly can work with will probably be available 2nd quarter of year 6. Cal Poly learns system with ATRC and then starts work with other DAMs. In the interim Cal Poly VIM will visit the site to learn operations as they progress.</p>	9/11 no further actions at this time.
7/13	DAMES	<p>7/13 Discussed ATRC involvement in the DAMES project. (Bill & Hold)</p> <p>8/22 Called Mike and discussed visiting a DAM that used Bill & Hold (DAMES). Apparel Mfg. Was the DAM decided on.</p> <p>8/30 E-m Mike about desired info from Apparel Mfg. about DAMES - will discuss after Julie visit.</p> <p>9/25 Discussed DAMES requirements with POC at Apparel Mfg. Received spreadsheet with information needed for monthly report.</p> <p>9/28 Faxed spreadsheet to PDIT. Discussed DAMES with Mike, PDIT.</p> <p>10/30 Discussed the integration of DAMES into ASAPWeb application with PDIT. PDIT sent attachment</p>	

		<p>of processes being worked on to date. Peckham Vocational Industries will be DAM Cal Poly will work with concerning DAMES.</p> <p>11/21 Called for assistance on using the DAMES software. Was directed to the following site to apply for a user id & password. http://www.daas.dla.mil. Logged onto the site and filled out an application for Cal Poly ATRC. Information will be emailed in 10 days. Mike McCarron, POC, at www.CERC.org. Steps to take on site are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Product support 2. Software and Documentation 3. Under DAASC link 4. DAMES System Access 5. Fill out form 	
7/18	ASCOT	<p>7/18 Spoke with Mike about ATRC's involvement with the new ASCOT website.</p> <p>10/30 ASCOT not being pursued with PDIT.</p>	
7/18	BIFRS-W	<p>7/18 Spoke with Mike about ATRC's involvement with the BIFRS-W application.</p> <p>10/30 Numerous conversations about using BIFRS-W with ARN partners. Contracts are being setup to use with system by CAR and DSCP. CAR will take lead on this project and assist Cal Poly after all problems are worked out.</p>	
8/25	Conference call - VPV members	<p>8/25 Conference call with Mike, Jean, Bill K., Debra to discuss working together in year 6. BIFRS-W test item discussed.</p>	
11/9	Conference call with staff of WInS system	<p>11/9 Received a call from Bob Walters including other staff members to discuss the problems and system requirements for testing ASAPWeb and WInS. Decisions made are:</p>	

		<p>1. Confusion on how DD250s are being submitted was cleared up.</p> <p>2. Missing DD250s is problem. Shelia and Mike will have to work out.</p> <p>3. To test the batch process using ASAPWeb, two prepaid DD250s will be submitted with hard copy being faxed to the POC at DFAS.</p> <p>4. To test the WInS application, one DD250 needs to be created and submitted.</p>	
10/27	Cal Poly and Bill & Hold	10/27 Cal Poly will become a Bill & Hold contractor in order to work with the newer systems.	
11/28	POC at MOCAS WInS site	<p>11/28 Placed a call to Dan Monroe concerning what is required for testing and production approval using ASAPWeb and batch submission? Discussed GFM prices and WInS system and that they will not be accepted. Gave Dan Mike's number and asked him to discuss how we can handle the problem. Was planning to work with Crown on this testing as they have a MOCAS contract but not sure if that will come about.</p> <p>11/28 Call from Mike - spoke to Dan and GFM will not be used with ASAPWeb and WInS in MOCAS.</p>	

December 1, 1999 - November 30, 2000
Activity/Issue/Problem Log
For VPV Miscellaneous

		Regulation	
1/24	FLW site	1/24 Viewed site for changes in order demand. E-m Jason on the status of updates. He explained that the update is done manually and that data is not always available to do weekly updates. 1/31 Site being updated.	4/27 <i>Will not view site unless information needed by Cal Poly.</i>
2/2	Demo shirt	2/2 Spoke to Mike about a monthly report on quantities in supply chain to do monthly Demo production. 2/2 PDIT called back for needed information. Gave them requirements. 2/3 Received information in text format. Information same as VIM site. 2/8 Spoke to Mike to verify data in VIM site updating. Mike assured me that the data is being updated. 3/1 Spoke to Mike - site is not being updated with correct shirt quantities. Mike will notify when site is working. 8/29 Demo shirt being produced on a regular schedule in Factory.	8/29 <i>No further action with Demo shirt as of this date.</i>
2/2	Demo shirt Delivery Order (D.O.)	2/2 E-m Al Carter about new way to get D.O. for short sleeve shirt. 3/16 Al returned call about Demo shirt D.O. He will fax his recommendations for review by Cal Poly staff. 3/20 Met with Jean, Pam, and Fran to discuss Al Carter's recommendations for Demo shirt.	

		<p>Agreed on sizes, quantities, and ship date. Will call Al Carter on 3/22 and share Cal Poly discussion.</p> <p>3/22 Called Al but not in office left message that will e-m what was discussed at Cal Poly. Will call him when return back at work after the 24th.</p> <p>3/27 Called Al Carter about Demo shirt. Informed him as to sizes and quantities that Cal Poly wanted to do. He agreed and will get D.O. ready. The 1st D.O. will be for the 900 shirts.</p> <p>3/29 Informed Fran that the following will be the monthly production. 15-1/2--180, 16--240, 16-1/2--180. Shipment will be at the first of the month.</p>	<p><i>4/4 Fran forwarded call from Al Carter. First shipment should be for April for 900. Agreed that shipment date should be changed to the 10th of the month.</i></p>
2/8	QLM Central	<p>2/8 Spoke to Bob Bona about effect sending Demo shirt to 32nd St. Annex would have on business rules.</p> <p>6/22 Meet with Jean - discussed ATRC's involvement with QLM Central.</p>	<p><i>2/8 Bob believes that there would be no effect. Resolved.</i></p>
3/17	Scanner	<p>3/17 E-m Bob Bona about using some of the technology used in ASAPWeb and QLM to place in a hand held scanner. This scanner would be used to eliminate the manual entries of WIP & FG into ASAPWeb.</p>	

		<p>3/20 E-m from Bob stating they could design a system using one of the scanners they use.</p> <p>3/20 E-m Bob back about cost of scanner and the possibility of using Cal Poly as a test site.</p> <p>3/28 Spoke to Bob more about cost of scanner. They scanner cost average \$2,000 and the cost for designing the software would be around \$8,000. Bob stated that he would be meeting with Julie and would discuss it with Julie as to whether she would be interested in funding the cost.</p> <p>4/5 Scanner discussed at review meeting.</p> <p>6/5 E-m Jean - should pursue scanner with Advantech.</p>	<p>3/30 Bob Bona e-m that Julie was not interested in funding the scanner - informed Jean.</p> <p>6/5 E-m from Jean that funds are not available for doing scanner work.</p>
4/20	Questions and answers web page	<p>4/20 Spoke to Mike about doing a "comments" page for DAMs on ASAPWeb. Since PDIT already has something similar on the 1st page of ASAPWeb, Cal Poly will not pursue the issue. It was decided that Cal Poly would design a Web page displaying all questions asked with the answers. PDIT will add VIM to the e-m list on their site so will receive the questions that go to PDIT's server.</p> <p>5/24 Worked on Questions and Answers for ASAPWeb.</p> <p>6/2 E-m Q & A to Mike for review.</p> <p>8/7 Reviewed Q & A page - added more questions.</p> <p>10/10 Questions added.</p>	
6/5	Software for factory	6/5 Discussion with Fran about what her requirements would be.	
6/14	Vendor pay site	6/14 Experimented with Cal Poly contract to try and locate payment information. Just general	

		<p>information available.</p> <p>6/14 Called Debbie to inform could not find any additional information.</p> <p>6/14 E-m to DFAS contact for help with site - no reply.</p> <p>6/14 Discussed EFT with Jean.</p> <p>6/15 E-m Mike & VPV parties for help with locating EFT contract info.</p>	
7/10	Visit Julie & John	7/10 Presented overview of VPV position to John. Demonstrated ASAPWeb system/	

Appendix I
Structure Chart

ATRC



